

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 16, 1985

The House met at 10 a.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We thank You, O God, for the gift of hope. When we experience weakness, You give us strength; when we know disappointment, You offer grace: when we feel alive and without purpose, You grant direction. For all Your gifts, O God, in strength and grace and direction and for Your loving gift of hope, we offer this our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Chidon, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 20th anniversary of Head Start.

WHAT HAPPENED TO TRUE TAX REFORM?

(Mr. KLECZKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, what is happening to the concept of true tax reform? The new tax package dubbed "Treasury II" which is to be presented to the country in late May is mysteriously being slanted in favor of the vested and special interests of this country. It seems that big business is winning. Slipping by us is the equity and the fairness that the American people have demanded. The President, it would appear, has backed away from reform in such key areas as oil and gas, real estate, business depreciation and capital gains. And the President dares to call all of this progressive.

The true special interest group of this country should be the people and

it seems they are being ignored in Treasury II. The people demand a simple and universal tax system. Individuals in this country must be the true beneficiaries of tax reform, not some corporate entity.

Instead, it would appear that once again the winners will be the corporations, the tax shelter beneficiaries, the privileged, the same group that benefited from the President's tax cuts of 1981.

The Congress must not tolerate this. We must enact a true and fair tax reform package. Our approach must be equitable.

Mr. President, the people of America are watching you.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WALLACE F. BENNETT, FORMER SENATOR FROM UTAH

(Mr. MONSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor for me to stand in these Chambers today to pay tribute to a man whose life stands as an example of unquestionable moral character, achievement, and service. Wallace F. Bennett served 24 years as a U.S. Senator from my great State of Utah, and in that time, he earned a reputation as a skilled legislator and an effective representative for Utah. It is my privilege to introduce a bill designating the Federal building at 125 South State Street in Salt Lake City, UT, as the "Wallace F. Bennett Federal Building." I believe it is only fitting that the Federal building be named after someone who serves as a paragon of excellence for so many in the State of Utah. His life history is one of achievement and success, not just as a U.S. Senator, but as an esteemed businessman.

While serving in the Senate, Mr. Bennett was the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, and senior Republican on the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. He served as secretary of the Senate Republican Conference, vice chairman of the Senate Ethics Committee, and a member of the Joint Committees on Atomic Energy, Defense Production, and Internal Revenue Taxation. He was also a member of the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Mr. Bennett's term of service is the second longest in the history of Utah

and is distinguished not only by its duration, but also by its quality. He is the only popularly elected Utah Senator to retire from office voluntarily.

One of Mr. Bennett's colleagues, former Senator Paul J. Fannin of Arizona, appropriately sums up my comments:

No man better represents these people [from Utah] and this heritage than the senior Senator from Utah, Wallace Bennett.

SUSAN PETERS KOGUT—PHYSICAL EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I would like to honor and congratulate a constituent of mine, Mrs. Susan Peters Kogut of Joppa, MD.

Susan has been named national "Physical Educator of the Year" by the National Association of Sports and Physical Education.

A teacher at Chesapeake High School, Mrs. Kogut's philosophy—"learning and physical education are for everyone; physical education is the culmination of these two things"—is exemplified by her programs in the Essex, MD, school.

Working with the handicapped, overweight, and troubled adolescent, Susan has gained well deserved national recognition for her concern and belief that physical fitness is for everyone.

As a spokesperson for the benefits of physical education, Susan believes that physical fitness is a healthy alternative to smoking, drinking, and drugs—that the teacher and the coach can have a positive influence on students in getting the message across.

It is always a pleasure to hear of someone's good fortune and achievement, but when the accolade is for working with our young people in the most constructive way, it is a positive joy.

Congratulations, Susan.

□ 1010

THE "JUSTICE" DEPARTMENT

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, if Lady Justice should come alive and witness the deal agreed upon by the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

U.S. Justice Department and E.F. Hutton & Co., Inc., she would untie her blindfold, drop her scales and flee in disgust.

The Justice Department is now mounting a determined defense of its decision not to prosecute individual officials in E.F. Hutton's \$4.35 billion bank fraud which adversely affected 400 American banks through a massive check-kiting scheme.

One prominent elected official said yesterday here in Washington and I quote from today's edition of the New York Times:

That the agreement not to try to send individuals to jail was a "travesty" and an "incredibly negligent, political judgment."

Associate Attorney General D. Lowell Jensen, whose nomination to be Deputy Attorney General is before the Senate Judiciary Committee, said yesterday that the Justice Department's strategy regarding E.F. Hutton produced a "tremendous favorable" result for the Government.

Mr. Jensen's statement gives added credibility to those of us who know that the U.S. Justice Department is the most politically conscious, politically active agency in the Federal Government.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Kentucky the rules of the House do not permit him to refer to Senate proceedings, and so the Chair would ask him to revise his remarks.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT OF 1985

(Mr. McCAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will combat one of the most terrible crimes in our society. I am referring to child pornography.

The U.S. Customs Office has estimated that in just the last 3 years they seized more than 247,000 pieces of pornography—70 percent of it depicted children. At least 1 million children have been sexually molested and then filmed for the abuser's pleasure or profit. Approximately 260 child pornography magazines are sold in this country.

The child pornography business makes profits in the millions of dollars. Until now, producers or distributors did not lose their assets when convicted. They might receive a sentence for their crimes, but still retained the profits made at the expense of exploited children. My legislation would include child exploitation crimes under the racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations [RICO] provisions, thus

providing for the seizure of all assets and profits made from this business. This bill, the Children's Protection Act of 1985, would also prohibit advertising of child pornography and make it punishable to transport minors across a State line for the purpose of sexual exploitation.

The child pornography business is one of the most horrible enterprises in society today. It exploits innocent children, often leaving them with emotional and physical scars that will last forever. We must enact appropriate measures that will put an end to this crime and severely punish those who would exploit and harm our children.

IMPLEMENT THE PROVISIONS OF THE BOATING SAFETY AND SPORT FISHING ENHANCEMENT ACT

(Mr. TALLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 165 which calls on the administration to honor its commitment and implement the provisions of the Boating Safety and Sport Fishing Enhancement Act, included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, as written and intended by Congress.

This act, commonly known as the Wallop-Breaux fund, is based on user fees paid by recreation fishermen and boaters. New taxes were imposed on fishing gear, with the support of the boating and fishing communities. In addition, the legislation recognizes that recreational boaters pay another user fee for which they were previously receiving only limited benefits—the 9 cents per gallon tax of fuel purchased for recreational boats.

When the Federal fuels tax was raised from 4 cents to 9 cents per gallon in 1982, the increase was clearly intended not as a new tax, but as a user fee that would provide direct benefits in the form of roads and other benefits to the people paying the tax.

Prior to the passage of the Wallop-Breaux legislation, the money attributable to the gas tax on motorboats was authorized to be spent on boating safety programs; however, very little was ever appropriated.

The new law mandated that the motorboat fuels tax and the new user fees, along with import duties on fishing tackle and pleasure craft, were to be placed in a special aquatic resources trust fund.

Yet, while earlier praising the legislation, the administration proposed in its fiscal year 1986 budget to repeal the automatic appropriation for the Federal aid in the Sport Fishing Restoration Act and to withhold new funds from the program.

The administration's attack on this program threatens to undermine the user fee concept which has served this and other programs so well.

Sportsmen have willingly supported user fees in the past because they believe in protecting our resources and because Congress has never broken faith with them.

Revenues from the Federal Government through the user fees are to be distributed by the Fish and Wildlife Service on a 75-25 matching basis to States to be used for boating safety, education and law enforcement purposes, construction of boating public access sites, as well as for fishing conservation programs.

While the administration proposes only a funding level of \$44 million in fiscal year 1986, the expanded program is estimated to bring in \$97 to \$102 million, with the remaining \$53 to \$58 million going into the General Treasury for deficit reduction rather than to the use for which Congress intended.

My State of South Carolina alone stand to lose as much as \$1 million a year if the present accounting procedure is allowed to continue to be used.

If user fees are collected but not returned, we will have turned this concept into special taxes for raising general revenues—a complete perversion of congressional intent.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution and send a strong message to the administration to operate this program in the manner in which Congress mandated.

THE INDIANA ELECTION DISPUTE

(Mr. STRANG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, we came to this body with an abiding faith in this country, in its people, in its ideals, and its institutions. We are a people of ideas and idealism, with faith in God and faith in ourselves. This faith, Mr. Speaker, is not misplaced.

Our conduct in wresting a legal election from the chagrined grasp of an incredulous Indiana electorate reflects neither a respect for law, nor idealism.

Mr. Speaker, this shame will not just quietly disappear as we have read recently. Respect for decency and for Mr. McIntyre dictates that we never forget.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND FIREARMS NEEDS TO GET TOUGH ON MAC-10'S

(Mr. TORRICELLI asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the subject of fighting crime, members of this institution, indeed, the leadership of our country, is eager to get in line. Now there is a line worth joining. Not for symbolism, not for talk, but for some real action.

Sometime ago, the Department of the Treasury made a terrible error. In judging a new gun, the MAC-10, they decided it was no more than a simple pistol, free from any Federal regulation. Time has proven otherwise.

With small changes, the insertion of a single coin, this gun becomes a lethal machinegun, in fact with more deadly power, greater firepower than the M-16 assault rifles used by the U.S. Army.

Mr. Speaker, legislation that I have introduced, H.R. 2024, would require that retroactively, these guns be subject to Federal regulation. They have become the favorite of organized crime, neo-Nazi groups, motorcycle gangs, extremist organizations, drug dealers, and other criminal elements fighting our law enforcement personnel across America.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The Department of the Treasury has recognized its error and prospectively has subjected these weapons to Federal regulation. The Congress must force them to do so retroactively as well.

This is a chance to get in a line that can move policy. Please join this effort.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PASSES NUCLEAR TEST BAN

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, by voice vote, the House Foreign Affairs Committee passed House Joint Resolution 3, dealing with limiting nuclear weapons testing.

House Joint Resolution 3 is an arms control measure that urges the President to request ratification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty and to resume negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty. The same language of House Joint Resolution 3 was passed in the other body last year by a vote of 77-22—a vote in excess of the two-thirds necessary for treaty ratification.

House Joint Resolution 3 is a proarms control measure which builds off the past arms control efforts of President Nixon and Ford and reaffirms the position of every President from Eisenhower to and including President Reagan to work toward a comprehensive test ban treaty.

As a manifestation of our commitment to nuclear nonproliferation, House Joint Resolution 3 demonstrates U.S. seriousness about bringing an end to the nuclear arms race.

Ratification of the Threshold Test Ban Treaty [TTBT] and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty [PNET] would result in enhanced verification of these treaties. Verification is enhanced because of the unprecedented exchange of data required by the TTBT and the PNET and provisions for onsite inspection required by the PNET. Such provisions make an assessment of Soviet compliance with these treaties easier and more reliable. These data exchanges, however, are not possible until the treaties are ratified, which is all the more reason why we in the Congress should work diligently and quickly to urge their ratification.

In short, House Joint Resolution 3 is a modest but concrete proarms control and proliferation enhancement measure that complements the administration's stated objective of bringing an end to the nuclear arms race.

THE TAX FAIRNESS FOR FAMILIES ACT

(Mr. COATS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, as House sponsor for H.R. 1551, the Tax Fairness for Families Act, I was obviously pleased to learn yesterday that the administration's tax plan included an apparent doubling of the personal exemption from \$1,000 to \$2,000 for each family member.

This is good news for families that have suffered inequity and discrimination in the Tax Code for many, many years.

□ 1020

However, I was a little bit concerned when I read that under discussion was the possibility that this might be phased in over a 3-year period.

You cannot phase in fairness, Mr. Speaker. It is either fair or it is not fair. And what is important to realize is that the \$2,000 level for personal exemption for members of the family is not a benefit. It is ending a discrimination that has existed and an inequity that has existed for a number of years. Were it to become a benefit, it would have to exceed what is rightfully the entitlement of families that had been indexed for inflation since 1948. That has not been the case. So let's go right to the \$2,000. It does not even bring us fully even to where we should be in terms of providing equity for family members, but it is a great step in the right direction. I am pleased that the

White House has moved this issue to the top of the priority list. We hope through negotiations in the next few weeks to make sure that that \$2,000 level is maintained.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION WEEK

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the celebration of the 13th annual National Historic Preservation Week. "The Action's Back on Main Street" is the theme this year and reflects the successful efforts of preservation and neighborhood groups to make their downtown areas once again a place to work, to play and do business. In my district, communities have learned that historic preservation is an extremely important economic development tool.

In Monongalia County, Main Street, Morgantown, Inc., has renovated several buildings on the National Register of Historic Places, which has made a significant contribution to economic revitalization.

In Berkeley County, an old mill building with flooding problems has been transformed into a \$5 million project. Martinsburg's Blue Ridge Outlet Mall, housed in a former textile mill, is responsible for 160 new jobs, will contribute \$1 million in sales tax revenue annually to the State and will benefit other downtown businesses.

Historic preservation can indeed prove to be a catalyst for economic growth. Our heritage does not have to be sacrificed, but can be incorporated into the future growth of our communities.

I salute the efforts of preservation and neighborhood groups in West Virginia, who are responsible for the action returning to main street.

SUNDY RESCISSION PROPOSALS, DEFERRALS AND REVISED DEFERRAL PROPOSALS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-68)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, May 16, 1985.)

SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT DESCRIBING FEDERAL ACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CONSERVATION AND USE OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS IN FEDERAL FACILITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, May 16, 1985.)

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 118]

Ackerman	de la Garza	Hawkins
Alexander	Dellums	Hayes
Anderson	Derrick	Hefner
Andrews	DeWine	Hendon
Anthony	Dickinson	Henry
Atkins	Dicks	Hertel
AuCoin	DioGuardi	Hiller
Barnard	Donnelly	Howard
Bartlett	Dorgan (ND)	Hoyer
Bateman	Dornan (CA)	Hubbard
Bates	Downey	Hughes
Bedell	Dreier	Hunter
Bennett	Duncan	Hutto
Bentley	Durbin	Jeffords
Bereuter	Dymally	Jenkins
Bevill	Dyson	Johnson
Blaggi	Eckart (OH)	Jones (OK)
Billirakis	Eckert (NY)	Kanjorski
Bliley	Edgar	Kaptur
Boggs	Edwards (CA)	Kasich
Boner (TN)	Edwards (OK)	Kastenmeyer
Bonior (MI)	Emerson	Kennelly
Bonker	English	Kildee
Bosco	Erdreich	Kindness
Boucher	Evans (IA)	Kleccka
Boulter	Fascell	Kolbe
Boxer	Fawell	Kostmayer
Breaux	Fazio	Kramer
Broomfield	Feighan	Lantos
Brown (CA)	Fiedler	Latta
Brown (CO)	Flippo	Leach (IA)
Broyhill	Florio	Leath (TX)
Bruce	Foglietta	Lehman (CA)
Bryant	Foley	Lehman (FL)
Byron	Franklin	Leland
Callahan	Frenzel	Lent
Campbell	Frost	Levin (MI)
Carper	Gallo	Levine (CA)
Carr	Gejdenson	Lewis (FL)
Chandler	Gekas	Lightfoot
Chappell	Gephardt	Lloyd
Clinger	Gibbons	Loeffler
Coats	Glickman	Long
Cobey	Gonzalez	Lowry (WA)
Coble	Goodling	Lundine
Coelho	Gordon	Lungren
Coleman (TX)	Gradison	Mack
Combest	Gray (IL)	MacKay
Conte	Gray (PA)	Madigan
Conyers	Green	Manton
Cooper	Grothberg	Markey
Coughlin	Guarini	Marlenee
Coyne	Gunderson	Martin (IL)
Craig	Hall (OH)	Martinez
Crockett	Hall, Ralph	Matsui
Dannemeyer	Hamilton	Mavroules
Darden	Hammerschmidt	Mazzoli
Daschle	Hansen	McCaIn
Daub	Hatcher	McCandless

McCloskey	Rangel	Staggers
McCollum	Ray	Stallings
McCurdy	Regula	Stangeland
McGrath	Reid	Stenholm
McHugh	Richardson	Strang
McKernan	Rinaldo	Studds
McMillan	Roberts	Sundquist
Mica	Robinson	Sweeney
Miller (CA)	Rodino	Swindall
Miller (OH)	Roe	Tallon
Miller (WA)	Roemer	Tauke
Mineta	Rogers	Tauzin
Mitchell	Rostenkowski	Taylor
Mollohan	Rowland (CT)	Thomas (CA)
Monson	Rowland (GA)	Thomas (GA)
Montgomery	Russo	Torricelli
Moody	Saxton	Towns
Moore	Schaefer	Valentine
Moorhead	Schneider	Vander Jagt
Morrison (WA)	Schroeder	Vento
Mrazek	Schuetz	Visclosky
Murphy	Schulze	Volkmer
Murtha	Schumer	Walgren
Myers	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Natcher	Sharp	Watkins
Neal	Shaw	Waxman
Nielson	Shelby	Weaver
Oberstar	Shumway	Weber
Obey	Sikorski	Weiss
Olin	Siskis	Wheat
Ortiz	Skeen	Whittaker
Owens	Slattery	Whitten
Oxley	Slaughter	Wirth
Packard	Smith (IA)	Wolf
Panetta	Smith (NE)	Wolpe
Pashayan	Smith (NH)	Wortley
Pease	Smith (NJ)	Wyden
Penny	Smith, Denny	Wyllie
Perkins	Smith, Robert	Yates
Pickle	Snowe	Yatron
Price	Solomon	Young (AK)
Pursell	Spence	Young (MO)
Rahall	Spratt	Zschau

□ 1040

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLECZKA). On this rollcall, 306 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 140 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1555.

□ 1045

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1555) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Arms Export Control Act, and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to authorize development and security assistance programs for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, with Mr. AuCoin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentle-

man from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1555, the International Security and Development Assistance Act of 1985, is a comprehensive, 2-year foreign assistance authorization bill which deserves the strong approval of the House.

I choose my words carefully and I mean precisely what I say: This measure deserves—indeed, demands—support for three simple but important reasons: it is responsible, it is necessary, it is practical.

Above all, it is fiscally responsible. It responds to the collective determination of this country and this House to spend less.

It is also necessary in terms of programs it contains which protect vital American interests abroad. These programs include:

Military aid to our friends and allies, which strengthens free world security and enhances our own defenses, including the use of military bases to U.S. forces around the world.

Special economic assistance to areas of strong strategic interest to the United States, particularly the Middle East.

Development and humanitarian help to poor countries, which will enable them to improve their economies through self-help.

Finally, H.R. 1555 is practical in the sense that what it means for Americans is jobs, further economic expansion, and important opportunities to restore some balance to our growing and serious trade deficit.

How does it do that? It does that by responding to the fact that the economies of developing countries over the past few years have become the fastest growing markets for American products at the same time that they are the source for materials needed by American industry. It is also practical since the great bulk of the so-called foreign aid in this bill is spent right here in the United States for services and goods produced by your constituents—American farmers and workers.

Two points I want to emphasize at the start are:

First, that is essentially a freeze bill. It authorizes appropriations of \$13,050,200 in fiscal 1986 and the same amount in fiscal 1987. Excluding the \$525 million increase which the President asked for Israel and Egypt for fiscal 1986, the fiscal 1986 total is below the \$12,774 million which Congress enacted in appropriations in fiscal 1985 for the programs under this bill.

The total also is \$191 million below the President's request for fiscal 1986.

Additionally, the bill freezes all line items for fiscal 1987 at exactly the same levels authorized for fiscal 1986, with no upward adjustments for inflation or any other increased costs.

For fiscal 1985, I should also point out, there is a \$1.5 billion supplemental item for emergency assistance to Israel to help Israel in its current economic crisis.

Second, it needs to be emphasized that this is the major vehicle for the Congress to exercise its influence and provide guidance in its foreign policy area. These are functions which are not and will not be carried out through a continuing resolution. And if the bill does not pass that is what we are going to get—another continuing resolution and a further weakening of the committee system in the Congress. This is not in anybody's interest.

The Congress needs an authorizing bill. Therefore, a vote for this bill will be a vote for Congress' role in foreign policy and a vote to uphold the legislative process.

Title I authorizes \$6,281,271,000 in fiscal 1986 and the same in fiscal 1987 for military assistance, a reduction of \$425,729,000 below the President's fiscal 1986 request. It contains cost-saving improvements in the Security Assistance Program which further reduce program costs by over \$600 million.

Title II authorizes \$3,900,400,000 in fiscal 1986 and fiscal 1987 for economic support fund assistance to areas where the United States has special political and strategic interests, a \$123.6 million reduction below the President's request. Also, \$1.5 billion is authorized for fiscal 1985 for special emergency economic assistance to Israel, and \$250 million for use in event of substantial progress toward a peaceful settlement of the Cyprus dispute; \$50 million a year in fiscal 1986 and 1987 would be for easier term credit for U.S. businesses in cases where they face subsidized competition from foreign companies. Also, \$5 million is authorized each year to Thailand for assistance to non-Communist forces in Cambodia, including military assistance.

Title III authorizes \$1,895,894,000 for development assistance to poor countries each year in fiscal 1986 and fiscal 1987, \$219 million above the President's request. Increases are for population and health programs abroad and \$50 million for the child survival fund.

Title IV authorizes \$819,966,200 for other foreign assistance programs each year in fiscal 1986 and fiscal 1987, \$124 million above the President's request. Increases are for American Schools and Hospitals Abroad [ASHA] and for U.S. voluntary contributions to the U.N. Development Program and the U.N. Children's Fund [UNICEF].

Title V authorizes and strengthens the International Narcotics Control Assistance Program including tying conditions on aid to certain Latin American countries to their antinarcotics efforts, earmarking funds for U.S. weapons to be installed on friendly country antinarcotics aircraft, and allowing U.S. agents to be present at narcotics arrest actions overseas.

Title VI sets up a scholarship program under the auspices of the U.S. Information Agency [USIA] and the Agency for International Development [AID] under which students from developing countries can come to study at American schools.

Title VII provides a policy framework for U.S. assistance to Central America designed to promote peace and democratic process.

Title VIII provides for improved programs for economic development in Africa; earmarks funds for regional programs in southern Africa; authorizes continued funding for the African Development Foundation and the Sahel Development Program.

Title IX authorizes the U.S. contribution to the second replenishment of the International Fund for Agricultural Development [IFAD]; strengthens food for peace programs extended through private voluntary agencies; provides for child immunization and farm-to-farmer aid programs.

Title X authorizes \$136,100,000 each year for the Peace Corps in fiscal years 1986 and 1987, an increase of \$11.7 million above the President's request.

Titles XI and XII contain miscellaneous other provisions including congressional policy statements on various foreign affairs issues. One provision creates a commission to oversee preservation of cemeteries and other facilities of historic interest to the United States because of the foreign heritage of Americans.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, this is a bill which carries out programs requested by the President as necessary for American interests abroad.

It helps our own defenses by helping those of our friends and allies abroad. It enhances our export sales and the potential growth of our markets in developing countries. It provides for humanitarian and developmental assistance to poor countries on an enlightened, self-help basis. It serves the cause of peace in areas of interest to the United States, particularly in the Middle East.

It is the best legislative vehicle we have, the principal vehicle for providing for congressional initiatives in foreign policy and otherwise carrying out the congressional role in the foreign affairs field.

And, it is a freeze bill.

I urge passage of the bill.

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1555, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985.

This important legislation was passed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in early April 1985 and authorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 of over \$13.05 billion annually which is nearly \$200 million less than the amount requested by the administration for foreign assistance for fiscal year 1986. Excluding a \$525 million increase request by the President for military assistance to Israel and Egypt in fiscal year 1986, the total in this bill is below the freeze level based on the continuing resolution appropriations which Congress voted for fiscal year 1985. This bill also authorizes some \$1.75 billion in fiscal year 1985 supplemental aid, of which \$1.5 billion is for Israel and \$250 million is for Cyprus.

This funding, which includes military assistance, economic support and development and humanitarian assistance is an essential component of American foreign policy. These funds help protect and promote U.S. political and military interests around the world as well as help others help themselves. They also help our national economy. Some 70 percent of these funds will be spent in the United States and represent hundreds of thousands of jobs here.

The interrelationship between our ability to protect key American national interests and the economic and security programs contained in this legislation can be dramatically illustrated by a quick perusal of how H.R. 1555 affects the Middle East and Europe. These two areas are to receive over 58 percent of the funds for fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987 contained in this bill.

EUROPE

In Europe, Mr. Chairman, this bill supports the continued vitality of NATO's southern flank and the strengthening of Western security interests in the Mediterranean region.

Four key NATO allies—Portugal, Spain, Greece, and Turkey—are to receive some \$242 million in economic support fund money, some \$285 million in grant military assistance and \$1.48 billion in foreign military sales financing in addition to military training funds.

Together these four nations, along with Italy and France, have responsibilities in NATO's southern region. Today, this region is increasingly vital to Western security. The political instability of the Middle East and Africa offers a possible arena for the Soviet Union's expanded interference there and in the Mediterranean, where its navy is already strong. We must help these nations, for they are a bridge linking the United States and the At-

lantic to the Middle East and Persian Gulf.

In each of these four countries the United States has important military facilities access agreements. Each access agreement is critical for the United States and the four agreements, taken together, provide the United States a critical link across the northern edge of the Mediterranean Sea. These allies look to the United States for assistance to augment their own contributions to Western security. All of these countries are upgrading their military forces and need American assistance and equipment. Thus, the assistance provided to these countries is among the most efficient forms of national defense expenditures and can make a substantial addition to U.S. national security interests and world peace.

Given Greece's important geopolitical location and our mutual security interests, Greece's continued close relationship with the United States is of vital importance. Therefore, there is \$498.25 million in security assistance for Greece in this bill. Greece has a socialist government and we have had differences with that government over the last 3 years, but we also have a mutual stake in maintaining a close and trustful dialog with that government and in preserving our security relations. Our long-term mutual interests will outlast our differences with any single government. Greece moves to parliamentary elections June 2 and we must hope that our dialog with Greece can improve in the aftermath of the elections.

Greece and the United States remain deeply intertwined nations. Many of America's leading citizens are of Greek lineage. The essence of our political cultures are the same. America's system of government is descended from Greece—the cradle of democracy.

Turkey is also an important country for the United States and its contribution to NATO is critical. Turkey is NATO's major link with the Middle East. It is the only Islamic member of NATO. We need to help Turkey with its economic and military needs in part because we should support Turkey's own impressive efforts to rebuild its country and economy. We should also encourage the ongoing political changes in Turkey, especially the return of a democratically elected government. The United States does have differences with Turkey on the Cyprus issue and on some human rights matters and these issues affect policy, but it is also true that Turkey, an Islamic nation, is a key pro-West country in a turbulent region with common borders with such states as Bulgaria, the Soviet Union, Iran, and Syria. We neglect Turkey at our own peril. This bill contains \$740 million in military assistance, \$150 million in economic aid

and \$4 million in military training for Turkey.

The \$15 million fiscal year 1986 economic aid program supported by this bill for Cyprus is another key sign of strong U.S. support for this island nation. Continued U.S. assistance supplements efforts to help facilitate a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus dispute. The frustrations of many Americans over the lack of progress toward a settlement of the Cyprus dispute is understandable, but I hope my colleagues realize that some progress has occurred in Cyprus intercommunal talks under U.N. auspices and we can perhaps look forward to renewed negotiations in the near future. I am sure my colleagues are aware of the continued importance of U.S. economic assistance for Cyprus to help deal with humanitarian, economic development and educational needs of the Cypriot people and to help implement any Cyprus agreement which the parties may reach. In recognition of this possibility, a \$250 million Cyprus reconstruction fund has been authorized in H.R. 1555 as a fiscal year 1985 supplemental. This action was taken pursuant to a Presidential request last May.

Spain is another country in Europe which is key to Western defenses. Even now it seeks to integrate its military more effectively into the Western security system. Democratic Spain will receive both economic and military assistance in this legislation. This assistance, which contains \$400 million in FMS credits, \$12 million in economic aid and \$3 million in military training, is pivotal if Spain's membership in NATO is to be solidified and we are to build a constituency for NATO in Spain. It will also help Spain's democratic government define a new and clear role for its military forces.

Portugal is also to receive substantial economic and security assistance in this bill—\$138 million in security assistance and \$80 million in economic aid. The United States renewed its bilateral base agreement with Portugal in December 1983, which gives the United States continued use of Lajes Air Base in the Azores Islands. U.S. assistance will promote Portugal's security, strengthen its democracy, and enhance its contributions to NATO and the defense of Western security as well as help alleviate the financial burdens of Portugal's troubled economy. It is in our interest to help Portugal economically because Portugal is already taking difficult steps to help itself through austerity programs.

Mr. Chairman, our assistance programs for these four NATO allies buttress vital Western security interests. Without this assistance, American access to key military facilities is compromised and the ability of our allies to strengthen their own defenses is weakened. NATO's southern flank is

vital to our interests and we must not let its security be undermined.

MIDDLE EAST

Mr. Chairman, the Middle East will receive over 40 percent of the funds authorized in fiscal year 1986 in this bill. These funds are closely related to American efforts to promote and expand the Middle East peace process and to strengthen the moderate forces in the region. While efforts to find a basis to restart the Middle East peace process proceed in the coming weeks and months, it is critically important to maintain the security and economic well-being of our friends in the region in the expectation that new opportunities for further progress toward a comprehensive peace will be created and that no party will foreclose those possibilities.

H.R. 1555 provides for:

An authorization for Israel in fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987 of \$3 billion annually in economic and military assistance to be provided on a grant basis. The United States has a historic commitment to Israel's security and economic well-being and U.S. assistance provides a tangible demonstration of the strength and durability of that commitment. The United States seeks to give Israel the confidence to take the risks necessary to pursue the peace process. It is a continuing principle of U.S. security assistance to enable Israel to maintain a qualitative edge in military technology in the Middle East. This is especially important because of the Soviet shipment of sophisticated arms to other countries in the region, and especially to Syria.

A fiscal year 1985 supplemental authorization for Israel of \$1.5 billion to be provided over 2 years to supplement Israel's own efforts to correct its economic problems. The extraordinary assistance is intended to give Israel some breathing space while its own new programs begin to take effect. Israel has undertaken some important steps but I think a vast majority of Israelis understand that further action is essential if this supplemental assistance is to be successful in helping Israel help itself at this time of economic hardship in that country. The United States and Israel are in the process of working out together important understandings about this assistance and its implementation. That process must go forward. We must all realize that in the final analysis, this one-time extraordinary U.S. economic aid can only be a supplement, not a substitute, for Israel's own efforts to reform its economy.

An authorization for Egypt for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 of some \$2.3 billion annually, including \$1.3 billion in military assistance, \$815 million in economic assistance and \$213 million in food aid. Egypt remains critical to

the success of U.S. regional political and strategic policies and these requests support U.S. policy. The United States and Egypt have a shared strategic interest in the stability of the Middle East and the surrounding region, especially Africa, and a shared strategic commitment to a peaceful solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Egypt has been an active partner in the Middle East peace process, and continued Egyptian support is crucial to its ultimate success. The Mubarak government publicly supports the President's September 1, 1982, peace initiative and is currently encouraging Jordan to enter the peace process and engage in bilateral efforts with Israel to improve their ties.

Smaller authorizations for economic and military assistance for other countries in the region: Jordan is to receive \$122 million; Oman \$60 million; and the Yemen Arab Republic \$41.5 million. We have important ties to these countries and a stake in what happens to each. Our programs with these countries promote broad U.S. policy objectives in the Middle East. In the case of Oman, our program is directly related to a military facilities access agreement for U.S. forces; Oman is located near the entrance to the Persian Gulf and abuts the Straits of Hormuz.

And an authorization of \$26 million for special Middle East programs to promote regional cooperative programs involving both Israelis and Arabs, economic development projects in the critical West Bank and Gaza area where significant proportions of the Palestinian people live, and regional program support and development. These programs are small in amounts but touch the lives of many people and promote the cause of peace.

Mr. Chairman, the United States continues to have a stake in what happens in the Middle East. We cannot walk away from the region because of frustrations with the peace process. We have important and interrelated interests there in the stability and well-being of friends, in access to oil, in reducing the tensions of regional conflict and in preventing the Soviets from obtaining an enhanced position in the area. These funds help us in promoting those interests. Without these programs, efforts to energize the peace process will be hampered.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to reiterate my support for H.R. 1555. Many Members may feel it is not a good time for any foreign aid bill and that the mood of the American people is against the legislation in general and for an absolute freeze of funding levels in particular. Given our significant domestic needs and priorities, the amount of resources being provided for assistance overseas is declining. But we must remember that we cannot confront the foreign policy challenges

we face and counter aggressive policies of our adversaries without the prudent use of economic and military assistance programs such as those contained in H.R. 1555. This bill supports key national interests overseas, promotes trade, and represents well over 400,000 jobs for Americans.

Mr. Chairman, let me add one final plea. This bill strikes a careful balance between security and economic programs and contains important policy guidelines. If there are any freeze amendments which might cut the amendments in the bill, I would hope that the amendments retain this important balance. A meat ax cut would not represent the interests of the Nation or the balanced interests of the Members of the House. We are only still in the early stages of the congressional process on this legislation and I am sure that over the coming months many of the provisions of this legislation with which some of my colleagues disagree can be modified.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of H.R. 1555 to let the authorization process proceed.●

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McKERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

Since it is my understanding that this weekend the Interparliamentary Conference between the United States and Canada will be held, I want to put the House on notice that next week, during the amendment process, I intend to offer an amendment to this bill to encourage the bilateral resolution of problems facing Canada and the United States. I commend the President for his efforts in this area.

Mr. Chairman, as we debate the foreign assistance authorization bill, we are shaping the course of our foreign policy. Something that should not be forgotten in this debate is how our foreign policy interacts with our economic relationships with other nations.

The tool of economic cooperation is powerful. It can be applied most directly and positively toward our trade relationship with underdeveloped countries. President Reagan's Caribbean Basin Initiative is a prime example of the importance of pursuing progressive and productive trade relationships in this hemisphere.

We also must not overlook the importance of continuing to improve our trade relations with the developed nations. Healthy and cooperative partnerships in trade not only ensure strong economies in the industrialized nations, but such partnerships also have a ripple effect that benefits all nations.

For this reason, I have a strong interest in working to improve the trade relationship between the United States and its biggest trading partner—Canada. Overall, we have positive trade relations with our friend to the north. There continue to be, however, specific, unresolved issues that mar this relationship. I believe that it is important that attention continue to be drawn to these issues.

For my State of Maine, these trade problems are particularly serious. The major concerns involve Canadian exports of potatoes, lumber, and fish. Exports, in large part subsidized by Canadian Federal and Provincial governments, have placed our Maine industries in jeopardy, inhibiting their growth potential.

Maine is not alone in its trade problems with Canada. States in the northwest with significant lumber industries, confront problems similar to those affecting Maine and there is also a host of other issues adversely affecting the United States which need to be resolved, including subsidized Canadian freight rates, Canadian Federal sales tax on tourist literature entering their nation, and hog and pork exports.

Mr. Chairman, House and Senate Members are going to Ontario this weekend to participate in the annual meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group. This meeting gives Members of both the U.S. Congress and the Canadian Parliament the opportunity to discuss at length bilateral trade concerns.

Our trade relationship with Canada deserves attention from legislators on both sides of the border. Because of the need for Congress to continue to look closely at this trade relationship, I plan to offer an amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill that calls for increased efforts to resolve Canadian-United States trade problems and requires the President to report to Congress on efforts to settle these problems.

The passage of this amendment will help us focus on the need to put equity in our trade relationship with Canada. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment when it comes before the House.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying that the administration opposes the committee bill, and, as well, it has not endorsed the substitute which I will be offering. As a matter of fact, the executive branch, including the OMB, opposes both the committee bill and the substitute that I plan to offer.

It seems that the administration, as far as my bill is concerned, wants more money for the military portion than I believe Congress and the American people will support.

At the outset, I want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for doing an admirable job in shepherding the committee through the markup of this very complex bill. Regrettably, he was unable to persuade the members of the committee to keep a sense of proportion on what I believe is the total price tag of this bill.

The bill before us, as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, represents a staggering authorization for foreign assistance of more than \$13 billion for each of the next 2 fiscal years, fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987, for a total 2-year authorization of over \$26 billion.

A breakdown of this amount will show that our ally and friend in the Middle East, Israel, alone would receive grants of \$6 billion, nearly one-fourth of the 1986 and 1987 total, plus a 1985 supplemental of \$1.5 billion under the previous provisions of the bill.

Also I point out that in this bill Egypt would receive \$4.3 billion, that is, 16 percent of the total, all in grants. That is for both countries.

To address the shortcomings of the committee bill, I will be offering a nonamendable amendment in the nature of a substitute. Again I point out, Mr. Chairman, despite the administration's opposition, my approach is a workable compromise. It reduces the total foreign aid authorization for fiscal year 1986 by \$50 million below the 1985 appropriation bill. This is truly below the freeze, and it freezes the level for fiscal year 1987, too. My proposal also remedies the numerous ambiguities in the committee's version of the bill.

The substitute I will be offering reduces the total authorization for each of the years, 1986 and 1987, by more than \$325 million below the committee level and more than \$516 million below the administration's request. On a 2-year, straight-line basis, my substitute would represent more than a \$650 million reduction from the committee's 2-year bill. It is more than a \$1 billion reduction from the 2-year level of the administration's request if we make the optimistic assumption of straight lining the request for fiscal year 1987. The Broomfield substitute maintains the same levels and earmarks, as the committee bill, for AID programs to Israel and Egypt, including, as I mentioned earlier, the \$1.5 billion for the economic support supplemental for Israel.

In a shortsighted move, I believe, the committee decided that about the only area in which it would reduce funds is in the military area. The committee made a total cut of more than \$425 million below the President's request in order to partly offset its hefty

increases in favored economic aid accounts.

□ 1100

There is no doubt that the so-called longer term economic development aid is an important and necessary part of a foreign aid program; however, there are equally important international problems requiring military assistance as well. My amendment would restore a modest amount to the FMS and MAP accounts. It would bring the total for all military aid accounts to within about \$1 million of the fiscal year 1985 levels, not including again the \$525 million increase in forgiven FMS for Israel and Egypt. While my approach has held security assistance somewhat below last year's appropriations levels, this lower amount is still adequate, in my judgment, to meet the minimum security requirements of our friends around the world.

There is no doubt that appropriate foreign aid programs do attempt to address important U.S. interests in security and equitable economic growth; but I strongly believe, Mr. Chairman, that foreign aid cannot be overlooked when significant cuts must be made in our Nation's budget. There are many domestic programs which serve vital national interests, too. They must be maintained. We must be fair in seeing that our foreign aid programs bear a reasonable share of the burden of helping to reduce the budget deficit.

While my substitute does not have administration support, at least at the present time, it is a fair compromise. It is also mindful of the need to trim our large budget deficits in an evenhanded way. It improves some of the policy language in the committee bill.

For these reasons, I hope the committee will support the substitute bill.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the gentleman's substitute would be below the 1985 appropriation in the current law; is that correct?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. PURSELL. Does the gentleman have an idea of the number of dollars, how far below?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. At least \$50 million.

Mr. PURSELL. At least \$50 million?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Yes.

Mr. PURSELL. And then I understand the committee bill that is in front of us is also below the 1985 appropriation, or did I misunderstand that?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I think according to our figures, the gentleman misunderstood that.

Mr. PURSELL. The present committee bill is above the 1985 current law?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. It is \$275 million, I am told.

Mr. PURSELL. It is \$275 million over 1985, based on the additions that the full committee made?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. FASCELL. We did not make any additions. This was the President's request for additional money for Israel and Egypt that was not in the 1985 appropriations. All we did was grant the President's request, which totaled an additional \$525 million; but because of the cuts we made elsewhere in the bill, we reduced that aggregate increase overall down to \$275 million.

In other words, we were able to absorb that much by making cuts below the 1985 appropriation level in other accounts.

Mr. PURSELL. But irrespective of the President's mark, which I understand is above the current law, the committee bill is also above current law and the gentleman indicated that it is because of the President's mark; is that appropriate?

Mr. FASCELL. That is absolutely right; but if you eliminate that, to look at it in a different way, eliminate the additional amount requested by the President for Israel and Egypt, the bill by that measurement is below the 1985 mark.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, if the ranking member will yield further, in principle we have had four major authorization bills here; NASA, the Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, and the State Department bills, principally they have been kept to the current legislation of the freeze of 1985. How could we now move above that freeze level with this committee bill, irrespective of the President's position?

Mr. FASCELL. Well, an amendment can just be offered to knock out the money for Israel and Egypt. That is one way to do it, if we want to do that.

Mr. PURSELL. Or we could reprogram that total amount, including Israel and Egypt, and reprogram it percentage-wise within the aggregate amount within the current 1985 level.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is absolutely right.

That is certainly a possibility. But let me point out further what can happen when you try that.

The gentleman from Michigan, who has expressed concern about insufficient military assistance, if I understood the gentleman correctly, has \$805 million for that purpose in his substitute.

The committee has \$761 million. To do what the gentleman is talking about, we would have to reduce that amount and then we would have to

take money out of the economic support fund also.

Yes; it can be done, but somebody would have to offer that amendment and the House would have to work its will. If that were to happen, then we would have to absorb the \$275 million.

Mr. PURSELL. I see.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, one of the things we did, recognizing the point the gentleman makes, which is very valid, is that we took other legislative action in this bill to produce an additional \$500 million that goes to the Treasury that was not produced before.

Now, that does not help the bottom-line in this bill in terms of the freeze application, but it is a \$500 million help to the taxpayers.

Mr. PURSELL. Especially, as I understood the gentleman's comment earlier, we have a \$1 billion supplemental for 1985.

Mr. FASCELL. Well, a billion and a half for Israel.

Mr. PURSELL. A billion and a half.

Mr. FASCELL. And that is not all.

Mr. PURSELL. That is worse.

Mr. FASCELL. That is not all. I do not know what else is coming in the supplemental appropriation, I really do not.

Mr. PURSELL. So in this case, we could have the administration opposing the bill because it is too low.

Mr. FASCELL. Well, that is quite possible.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I can answer that. They are already doing that.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman from Michigan has worked very hard and we have worked together in trying to bring a sensible bill to the floor; but the problem the gentleman has is that he ran into objections from the administration, who said, "You know, you are cutting our heart out."

They do not like our bill because we cut below the President's request and put in some statements that they do not like. We have the unusual situation, I might add, that in the other body they did worse than that. They did not support the President at all.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. That is exactly right.

Mr. PURSELL. But at this point, we are trying to find a common ground here so that we can stay consistent with all the authorizations.

Mr. FASCELL. Absolutely.

Mr. PURSELL. And eventually in the appropriation bills, so that we maintain the budget mark that the gentleman is going to be presenting in the budget resolution next week.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman raises a very good point in referring to the budget mark.

Let me just say that between the gentleman from Michigan, and myself, and the rest of the members of the committee, we think we have done well by making the cuts that we have.

Mr. PURSELL. Can I ask a further question with respect to the budget mark that has arisen over in the Budget Committee?

Mr. FASCELL. I was afraid that the gentleman was going to ask that. I do not know how to handle that budget mark.

Mr. PURSELL. Well, we are premature here in looking at this legislation without the budget ahead of us, and I realize the Armed Services Committee has the same problem, so we are going to lift this bill, as I understand it, and move it to a subsequent date to consider amendments and maybe by then we might know what the mark is in the House. We know certainly what the mark is in the Senate in respect to trying to maintain a basic freeze, because a basic freeze only gives us \$32 billion in the aggregate overall, so we have to look at other programs; and so to treat foreign aid consistently with the State Department, NASA, and all the other programs, I think it is incumbent that we try to work our will here with an appropriate compromise.

Mr. FASCELL. I cannot argue with the gentleman, if he will yield further, but from the rumors I hear about what the budget mark is going to be, I do not know how you are going to handle that. The international affairs 150 account is taking a whipping; but nevertheless, the point that the gentleman raises is valid.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER].

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by commending the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for the magnificent job he has done in handling this legislation and bringing it to the floor.

I also want to commend the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for his hard work.

Mr. Chairman, 20 years ago the Congress authorized in the very best bipartisan sense one of the most important aspects of American foreign policy, which is under severe attack in the current Congress. That was legislation authorizing, for the first time, funds for voluntary family planning assistance in the developing world.

Last evening, in the other body when similar legislation was adopted, unfortunately an important provision which the House committee inserted, authorizing \$320 million for population, was very badly damaged.

It is my understanding that when this legislation comes to the floor of the House, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], will offer similar amendments, with due respect to my colleague, the gentleman from New

Jersey, will undermine very severely these most important provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Mr. Chairman, there are essentially two targets for these amendments. The first is the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, and the second is the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

□ 1110

The objections which we will hear to the \$46 million which we authorized to the UNFPA is that the UNFPA currently has a modest program in China. The Chinese Government's population program is one which we have heard a great deal about lately and one which all of us feel very strong objection to for a number of the things which are happening in the People's Republic of China.

But I think there are a number of things which are very important to recognize. First of all, the U.N. Fund for Population Assistance Program in China is distinct from and in no way involved in the coercive aspects of the Chinese program. This has been affirmed by the Reagan administration. AID has certified and given to the UNFPA a clean bill of health for the manner in which it operates in the People's Republic of China.

Second, no U.S. funds which go to the UNFPA are used in the People's Republic of China. Those funds are held in entirely separate accounts and not a single cent of American money is used in any way directly or indirectly in the UNFPA Program in China.

The UNFPA I think, and I think AID officials would agree, acts as a moderating and a restraining influence on the program in China.

But what will happen if the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is agreed to, an amendment which would reduce by one-third the budget of the UNFPA, a cut of \$46 million.

That amendment, if it is adopted by the House, will not affect the program in China at all but it will cripple the programs in 115 other countries in which the UNFPA operates. It will do severe damage to the voluntary family planning programs in other countries while not affecting the program in China at all because no U.S. money is spent there.

The second amendment which I believe our friend from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will offer, has to do with the International Planned Parenthood Federation. In December of last year, the administration cut the \$17 million which the United States provides to the International Planned Parenthood Federation. The Foreign Affairs Committee in its deliberations restored that \$17 million.

That \$17 million is one-third of the IPPF budget. But the gentleman from

New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] believes that the United States should not provide any funds at all to IPPF because of the following reason: Of the entire \$50 million IPPF budget, \$17 million of which comes from the United States, of that, \$300,000 is spent for materials, training, and services in activities related to voluntary abortions. None of that \$300,000 is American money.

IPPF is an organization which is doing vital work in the Third World.

Yet, because of that small expenditure for entirely legal activities in certain countries, we would undermine the entire program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I was in Ethiopia last November and saw the terrible suffering there. In Ethiopia, the food production is declining on a yearly basis, yet the population is increasing at an annual rate of 3.7 percent. In India, there are 1 million people born every 30 days. In Nigeria, in just 76 years, there will be as many people as there are currently in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Chairman, this is a modest, yet desperately important program. I would ask the House when the foreign aid bill comes before us to resist those amendments to be offered and to support the committee and, indeed, to support the administration on allowing these funds to be expended.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to commend the gentleman in the well for his leadership on this issue in the committee. He was very, very persuasive because the committee position in the bill is a position of the majority of the committee that supports this viewpoint. I would hope that we could keep this small amount of money in the bill.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], a member of the committee.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for yielding me this time.

First of all, in rising to oppose the committee bill, let me make two points.

One, even though the bill does carry the dollar figures that the administration has asked for, I would like to point out that President Ronald Reagan is only right 99 percent of the time, and 1 percent of the time he is wrong. And that is when he is offering this bill as far as the dollar figures are concerned.

In rising to oppose the bill also I would like to in no way diminish from the work and the efforts that our outstanding committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida, DANTE FASCELL, and his staff, as well as the rank-

ing member, the gentleman from Michigan, BILL BROOMFIELD, and his staff, and the tremendous job they have done. Any time you try to develop a foreign aid bill and you try to satisfy people like President Reagan, and you try to satisfy people like GERRY SOLOMON, and DANTE FASCELL, and all of the others from the liberals to the conservatives, you have an almost impossible job. So I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], you have done an outstanding job and so has the gentleman from Michigan, BILL BROOMFIELD.

Mr. Chairman, a number of my colleagues from this side of the aisle have outlined the serious problems with this foreign aid bill, problems that will have to be addressed by a large number of amendments if this bill can command any support at all from conscientious Members of Congress, let alone the support of the American people and I certainly concur with the statements that have been made.

I would like to take a few moments right now to discuss a particular aspect of the bill that I find very troubling because I am greatly concerned about what the committee has done concerning the aid package for the Philippines. It would seem that we engage in this little shell game every spring. The administration comes down here and proposes a well-conceived and well-balanced package of security and economic assistance for the Philippines, which the committee then tinkers with to front load the package with ESF and to shortchange the security assistance. Under this bill, the administration's FMS proposal for the Philippines is eliminated altogether, and the proposed military grants for the Philippines are cut in half.

It may be that the committee wants to insulate itself from any eventuality that may occur in the Philippines—to be on the right side of history as some might put it—but this bill is simply not the way to help an ally in need. Once again the foreign aid bill is raising the bogeyman that security concerns and economic needs in the Philippines are mutually exclusive. This one-dimensional approach to foreign policy has become almost obsessive because the problems in the Philippines today are political, economic, and military. We must address all three simultaneously if we are to address them at all. It is neither honest nor courageous for us to choose one problem, neglecting the others and wishing that the areas we are neglecting will somehow take care of themselves.

What the committee chose to ignore in its juggling act on this bill is that the Philippines Government has worked with the IMF to introduce austerity measures and across-the-board spending reductions in all areas of the public budget. Military spending, even during a time of insurgency threats,

has been reduced by more than one-third—to a level now amounting to little more than 1 percent of GNP.

The committee chose to ignore that even if the administration's security package for the Philippines would be approved in its entirety, the funds made available would be enough to maintain only the status quo, to make up for last year's reductions and to allow the Philippines Armed Forces to repair existing equipment and deal with other maintenance problems. Moreover, a sizable portion of the administration's security package is devoted to civic action projects like road-building and public health services in areas of the Philippines that are affected by the insurgency of the Communist New People's Army.

I plan to offer an amendment that will restore the original mix of security and economic assistance in the administration's proposal for the Philippines. After having visited the Philippines in April and talking with President Marcos, I am more convinced than ever, that now is the time to be standing shoulder to shoulder with our friends in the Philippines. They are the indispensable link in our chain of defense in the Western Pacific and Southeast Asia and we owe it to them as allies to help them with their needs.

Let me just conclude, Mr. Chairman, by making one other observation about this bill. One of the things I find most offensive about this particular bill is the manner in which it shortchanges friends—such as the Philippines—and loads up with all kinds of extraneous programs and spending schemes for countries and organizations of dubious worth. This problem comes into special focus when one realizes that this bill is more than \$400 million above last year's continuing resolution.

I plan to offer an amendment that will make sure that the aggregate total of spending authority in the bill will not exceed by one penny what is contained in last year's continuing resolution. At a time when we are asking the American people to make sacrifices, it makes no sense at all to continue pouring billions of dollars into countries and programs that are neither grateful nor responsible for the support we give them. In its present form, this bill does not provide an appropriate or plausible venue for the conduct of American foreign policy.

□ 1120

I made a statement on the floor yesterday that we have had "Dear Colleague" letters and we have had resolutions being circulated asking for us to cosponsor them which would reinstate the tax exemptions on local taxes for government, put that back in the budget, put back in revenue sharing, put back all these things, and I

mentioned that I had accumulated all these "Dear Colleague" letters and resolutions which totaled the entire \$50 billion deficit reduction program that President Reagan has offered to us.

If we enacted all of them we would have no deficit reduction and we would go back to the 14-percent Jimmy Carter inflation, we would go back to the 22-percent interest rates of Jimmy Carter. We cannot do that.

So here is your chance, ladies and gentlemen, when I offer my amendment tomorrow or whenever this bill comes back on the floor to cut this bill back by \$400 million, just to last year's level, I want you to support it because then I might support one of your recommendations to reinstate revenue sharing or some of these other programs.

Just think about these things until next week when we come back, and we will have a good bill when we are finished.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I was interested in the previous speaker's criticism of the administration's excessive request for foreign aid. But that is not the subject that I wanted to address.

The nation of Portugal has been a very strong ally of the United States and it has been one which in recent years has made that transition from a repressive regime to a thriving democratic regime. So that we now have both from the human rights standpoint and from the geopolitical standpoint a strong ally.

The committee, under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has been very generous in recognizing that relationship. I know the gentleman from California [Mr. COELHO] and I both have a particular interest in that relationship.

I wonder if the chairman [Mr. FASCELL] could confirm for us the particular figures which, while not written into the bill, are the intention of the committee to be conveyed to Portugal if the bill is passed as written.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from California who has the figures.

Mr. COELHO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, in the subcommittee report they basically said that it was the intent of the subcommittee that the \$80 million for economic support fund and \$70 million for military assistance and \$65 million for the foreign military sales, that was the intent

of the subcommittee and it was not in the full committee report.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and I were wondering as to whether or not it is the full committee's intent that this money be given to Portugal.

They have been a great, willing partner of the United States. The President, as you know, was just there.

The relationship between our two countries is probably at the best that it has been in years. We were just wondering what the intent of the full committee was.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield, let me assure the gentleman from California [Mr. COELHO] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] that the full committee is very well aware of Portugal's importance as a close and friendly ally. We have supported fully in the committee and in the subcommittee, as the gentleman pointed out, the President's requests for Portugal in all fields, foreign military sales, grant military assistance, and economic support funds.

This bill that is before us now accommodates all of those requests for Portugal.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and the gentleman from California [Mr. COELHO].

The gentleman from California and I, as well as my colleague from Massachusetts who serves on the committee [Mr. STUBBS] and the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentlewoman from Rhode Island have a particular interest in the Azores.

Mr. Chairman, we note with some satisfaction what the chairman says because the economic support funds in particular are generally passed along to the regional government of the Azores in recognition of their very strong cooperation with the United States through the Lajes Base.

So that makes us particularly satisfied.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] raises a very good point. That is one of the things which even the gentleman from New York who preceded us [Mr. SOLOMON] was trying to make with respect to our base-rights agreements with these important allies. That is a reason why this bill is so important in the security interests of the United States.

Portugal is a country with whom we have a good and friendly relationship. Our security interests are directly involved.

Mr. COELHO. And in the case of Portugal they have agreed to the extension of the lease with regard to the Air Force base there.

Mr. FASCELL. They have been totally cooperative, the Government and the people of Portugal have been totally cooperative and we recognize that in this bill.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. COELHO. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], a member of our committee.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1555, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe the previous remarks of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] have described effectively the need this year for passage of a foreign assistance bill. I want also to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. I have had the privilege to serve as the ranking minority member on that subcommittee, and I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana for the diligence and well-reasoned approach he brought to the consideration of the issues before our subcommittee which have a high priority on our Nation's foreign policy-making agenda.

The measure before us authorizes for the fiscal year 1986 approximately \$13 billion for those programs necessary for the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. As the committee report notes:

Excluding the \$525 million increase requested by the President for military assistance to Israel and Egypt in fiscal year 1986, the total is below the freeze level based on the continuing resolution appropriations which Congress voted for fiscal year 1986.

The legislation provides needed economic and military support to Israel as that long-time ally of the United States struggles to get its economic affairs back on track and to assure that its defenses are strong to combat forces hostile to United States and Israeli security interests. The measure also contains aid for Egypt in the hope that nation can participate effectively in the process that seeks a lasting peace in the Middle East.

The measure contains carefully prepared provisions enabling the United States to respond more effectively to the problems of global hunger and malnutrition and to the spreading menace of international narcotics trafficking.

In other areas, H.R. 1555 provides funding to meet our Nation's commitment in many regions of the world including, for example, with those nations which we have base rights agreements.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I on the committee devoted a substan-

tial amount of time and attention to the consideration of the measure under discussion. There will be some areas of the bill which I am sure will receive considerable scrutiny as alternative proposals are debated by the House. It is my hope, however, as our deliberations unfold, that discussion can proceed in a manner that seeks to produce legislation that can respond effectively to the foreign policy challenges our Nation faces. It is important, Mr. Chairman, that we adopt a measure which can be guided through the legislative process this year and which can serve as the principal vehicle for articulating congressional concerns and proposals for the conduct of foreign policy.

□ 1130

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that one of the things that the American people have been screaming for in terms of foreign aid is to at least assure that if we are going to put money out overseas that we assure that we get it to our friends, that we use our foreign aid money to support those people who have a policy which is friendly toward the United States.

When we get to the appropriate time, and I understand that may be a matter of weeks instead of days, I intend to offer an amendment aimed at that kind of a foreign policy option.

It essentially takes the Kasten amendment that was placed in the supplemental appropriations bill last year and expands upon that by saying that if a country does not vote with us at least 15 percent of the time in the United Nations, that they would be regarded as an unfriendly nation, and that the President would have to certify to Congress that, for national security or humanitarian reasons, that they be waived in order to get foreign assistance rather than having them automatically into the foreign assistance stream.

In other words, you would have to be with us at least 15 percent of the time up in the United Nations to be regarded as a friend. Now that does not seem to me to be a very tough obligation. In fact, the reason for that figure is that is about the amount of time that the Soviet Union votes with us. We get the Soviet Union to vote with us up in the United Nations about 15 percent of the time.

So all we are going to do is require that nations vote with us at least as much as the Soviet Union does before we start pouring foreign aid out across the world into these countries.

So this amendment would be aimed at attempting to achieve that particular goal. It should not be surprising to

many that there are a number of nations in the world which in fact vote with us at the United Nations less times than the Soviet Union does.

I would propose in my amendment to first of all have a constant report as to who those nations are; and then assure that we are not giving foreign aid. The fact is that most of those countries do not receive foreign aid now.

I think what we need to do is say to the American people that, you have our assurance that we are not going to begin to pour your tax dollars into countries that are not in compliance with some kind of a voting pattern, that it assures friendship with the United States.

The American people are disgusted, in all honesty, with a program that continues to pour out money, often to no avail. This is an attempt to begin to tighten down. I think that some aspects of American foreign policy need to get tough.

In fact, we had a vote on the House floor the other day which showed that the American people are willing to get tough and their representatives are willing to get tough when we voted on the question of how to deal with the Major Nicholson matter.

The gentleman from Michigan, I think, courageously brought to the floor an amendment that finally got tough with that particular aspect of our foreign policy.

I think this body ought to get tough in some other aspects; particularly how we spend our money in foreign policy, and here is a chance with an amendment to get tough again, by saying that we are going to give money across this world, when we do it, only to people who can be certified as friends of the United States.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend you on your efforts and leadership in the sometimes difficult job of chairing a most important committee and on your hard work on this bill.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, in recent weeks I have seriously considered offering an amendment to H.R. 1555 that would have stripped out a significant amount of United States assistance to Haiti.

The Government of Haiti continues to commit egregious violations of human rights. These were once again highlighted, recently by several groups appearing before the Human Rights Subcommittee. Besides grinding poverty, the people of Haiti are forced to live without the simplest of liberties and political dignity that so many Americans take for granted. For reasons such as this, I am a cosponsor of a resolution introduced by Congressman OWENS, calling for the with-

drawal of the determination that the Government of Haiti is making progress toward human rights and political reform. I urge all my colleagues to join in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 120.

Also, as you know, Mr. Chairman, the case of an American citizen who suffered a loss of millions of dollars at the hands of the Haitian Government remains unresolved. Don Pierson, of Eastland, TX, has pursued his case for several years and I will help him continue to pursue it until the wrong done to him has been righted. Mr. Pierson was under contract to develop a freeport authority that would have brought much employment and commerce to an impoverished nation, until the Government of Haiti unjustifiably canceled his contract and seized his property without anything approaching due process as we know it. I have appreciated the interest shown in Mr. Pierson's case by several members of the committee and have appreciated the interest and guidance offered by our colleague, Chairman BARNES, of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee.

In view of the facts I have mentioned, I was prepared to bring an amendment to the floor to reduce aid to Haiti. I am not offering that amendment today for two reasons:

First, I want to acknowledge the efforts made by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee to limit and condition aid to Haiti in a way meant to maximize assistance actually reaching the people and to promote human rights. A number of our colleagues want to avoid the possibility of "throwing the baby out with the bath water" and I am willing to wait and to continue examining the efficacy of such an approach of offering only specially limited aid.

Second, I am hopeful that an administrative remedy can be pursued on behalf of Mr. Pierson one more time, this time with fruitful results. A new review of his case has been initiated, a review that I have been assured will be a thorough and objective one. In the past, I have very much doubted that the State Department asserted Mr. Pierson's rights and advocated his claim as strongly as it should for an American citizen. I am watchful and hopeful that this new review will produce a more just result.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, let me say for the gentleman in the well, that I certainly appreciate his persistence, and I know that his constituent does.

Having been in the same position myself with respect to a constituent that had that kind of problem, I know the difficulty.

I must say that the gentleman is acting in a very appropriate manner. I appreciate his statement very much

and the fact that he is not offering an amendment. I say that wholeheartedly, having been in the same position. I believe that you are doing everything that can possibly be done for the constituent that you represent, and I can assure that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is behind your effort. We will monitor the study of the State Department very carefully, and hope that some way can be found to resolve the problem.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the chairman for those comments; that is exactly what I hope to do.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], a member of our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, as I often stated in recent months, Congress' irresistible penchant for micromanaging foreign policy is imperiling the security of this Nation. The legislation before us epitomizes what I mean.

For example, the authors of this legislation caricature arbitrarily cut the President's fiscal year 1986 request for security assistance by more than \$549 million. But before anyone gets the idea that this was done in the name of austerity, I must point out to my colleagues that most of these reductions were offset by transferring these ersatz savings into the pet economic assistance accounts of the committee's grand designers of foreign policy.

I have nothing against economic assistance, but when you have a finite number of dollars, security assistance becomes of transcendent importance. Pouring primarily economic assistance into insecure societies may have some very short-term benefits, but as a useful solution to the long-term and nearly intractable problems of these nations, it is about as beneficial as providing a blind man a pair of glasses. Of what good, for instance, would economic aid be to El Salvador if we did not also provide an adequate security assistance umbrella?

The incongruities in this bill are mind boggling. It correctly authorizes generous amounts of money for Israel and Egypt in clear recognition of what these two nations represent to our national security. Yet, with respect to El Salvador, a struggling and besieged ally in desperate need of large doses of U.S. aid to sustain President Duarte's embryonic democratic revolution, this measure cuts the President's request by \$54.5 million.

What kind of a signal is that to send a friend in need?

Equally perplexing and counterproductive is the decision of the committee's majority to recommend a net cut of \$25 million for Pakistan, another friend in difficult circumstances, with nearly 4 million Afghan refugees who

have fled the Soviet rape of their homeland.

The committee never forgets to pillory its favorite whipping boys. Consequently, Zaire, one of Israel's best friends in Africa, took its annual beating to the tune of \$6.4 million.

Of course, legislation from this committee would not be complete without a plethora of idiosyncratic foreign policy promulgations. Some of them are even gratuitous as in the case of the Contras in Nicaragua. Even though the administration did not request any funds in this bill for these freedom fighters, you will find a provision prohibiting such aid.

Paradoxically, you will also discover assistance for the freedom fighters in Cambodia and Afghanistan. With convoluted sophistry, rationales were articulated during the committee's consideration of H.R. 1555, that justified supporting patriotic resistance forces on the other side of the world while rejecting the pleas of their counterparts in our own strategic backyard. I am sure that you will hear some of these clever Contra distinctions repeated here today, but as far as I am concerned, they are nothing more than a nuance without a nuance.

□ 1140

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] has expired.

All time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding additional time to me.

For example, you will be told that the non-Communist resistance in Cambodia is fighting against a foreign invader—Vietnam. Well, suppose only Pol Pot and his Khmer Rouge were in control and practicing their genocide on the population. Would you then deny funds to the resistance? In Afghanistan, yes, they are suffering a Soviet invasion, but there is as yet no export of revolution across their borders, so the legal case for defending El Salvador is even stronger.

We are always prepared to fight World War II again—but in the modern world, conquest occurs by subversion and wars of liberation supported and controlled from without but occurring from within. We seem paralyzed in our efforts to deal with this—placing our trust in negotiations unsupported by force—as if the Communists will yield any power because we ask them to—or the Contadora countries ask them to.

This committee has placed its bet on the good will of Mr. Ortega—and where I come from, that's called a sucker bet. We should support free-

dom fighters wherever they are—or forfeit the claim to be leaders of the free world. If any slogan can be applied to the majority of this committee, it would be "don't seize the moment!"

In keeping with the committee's principle that the closer to home the more we micromanage, proponents of this bill also decided to infringe upon the President's constitutionally mandated foreign policy and war powers responsibilities. Specifically, they approved highly restrictive language regarding the deployment of U.S. Forces into or over El Salvador or Nicaragua. Now I don't envision the need for U.S. Forces in these areas, but why needlessly add a provision which would be construed as an invitation to the Sandinistas to engage in either military or paramilitary activities against their neighbors? This committee makes us enforcers of the Brezhnev doctrine but must we tell the world about it? It just does not make good sense to stipulate prohibitions which appear to preclude some uses of defensive military force, short of declared war. Even the constitutionally questionable War Powers Resolution does not go this far. The isolationism reflected in this legislation betrays an ignorance of modern history that can only extract a fearful price in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on endlessly about my objections to this bill. In the interest of time, however, I will sum up by saying that unless it is significantly improved during the amending process I will be unable to support this legislation, since on balance it does more harm than good.

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1555, the International Security and Development Act of 1985.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL, for having once again guided the committee through the consideration of the foreign aid bill. The fact that this bill is before us today is a tribute to the chairman's statesmanship. I would also like to commend the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, for their leadership and cooperation during the consideration of the bill.

The levels of assistance contained in the bill before us are extremely modest compared to the objectives that we seek to achieve. The bill authorizes the appropriation of slightly more than \$13 billion for fiscal year 1986 and the same amount for fiscal year 1987, and a supplemental authorization of \$1.75 million for fiscal year 1985. We achieved a cut of more than \$191 million below the amount re-

quested by the President. The committee has acted very responsibly in responding to the severe budget constraints that we all recognize.

The savings were achieved by making necessary cuts mostly in military assistance programs, while protecting and sometimes increasing the levels of economic assistance. The members of the committee feel that while military aid programs are obviously important, economic aid programs contribute the most to U.S. interests by promoting development and stability. The economic aid increases went to programs that over the years have provided a significant return on our investment on human capital, such as the Peace Corps, the Inter-American Foundation, the African Development Foundation, and international organizations.

This bill also incorporates the provisions contained in H.R. 1340, the U.S. Scholarship Program for Developing Countries, which was introduced by the majority leader. It was an honor for me to support the leader's proposal, which provides for scholarships to disadvantaged students from developing countries.

The bill also provides for a higher level of assistance for population programs, and clarifies the intent of the Congress with respect to U.S. funding for population activities. As demonstrated to some extent by the tragedy in Ethiopia, we now know that population programs are crucial to the survival of millions of people and to the development and stability of countries in the Third World. Our programs seek to guarantee that couples will have access to education and population programs that will help them achieve a desired family size.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs I would like to explain some of the provisions in the bill that pertain to that region. Recognizing that Central America has been one of the most controversial issues discussed in the Congress, the subcommittee and the committee worked very hard to formulate recommendations that we felt would be acceptable to the majority of the Members of the House. We now bring this bill to the floor confident that the end product of our efforts merits the support of this Chamber.

During the last year the committee has followed with much interest the efforts of Salvadoran President Jose Napoleon Duarte to negotiate with the guerrillas and to seek an end to human rights violations by military and security forces. In cooperation with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, the committee adopted a semiannual reporting requirement in order to support the democratic government of President Duarte. The report, which

would be required as a condition of disbursing military aid, would deal with: First, the Salvadoran Government's willingness to pursue a dialog with the opposition; second, the Government's control of the military and security forces; third, progress in ending the activities of the death squads; fourth, progress in establishing an effective judicial system; and fifth, progress in implementing the Land Reform Program. These are all areas that the administration and the Salvadoran Government have also identified as crucial to peace and development in El Salvador. Although the language requires that military assistance be disbursed in tranches, we accommodated the concerns of the ranking minority member by allowing for a waiver in case of an emergency. The bill also provides for the termination of all military assistance if the elected President is deposed by military coup or decree. In response to concerns about the indiscriminate bombing of civilians, the bill also provides for a report to Congress whenever new helicopters and aircraft are provided to El Salvador.

Although many of us were encouraged by the elections in Guatemala last year, we are still concerned that in recent months there has been an escalation in the number of disappearances and murders of civilians. In order to express congressional support for the transition to democracy, the bill contains a prohibition on military assistance to Guatemala until there is an elected civilian government in power which has requested such aid. The aid will be of a nonlethal nature.

The legislation continues the provisions currently in the law with respect to Haiti. It also prohibits the use of the Foreign Assistance Act funds for military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua. The bill provides for limitations on the introduction of armed forces into El Salvador and Nicaragua for combat, which is similar to the Foley amendment adopted by the House last year, and requires a Presidential notification to the Congress on U.S. military exercises in Central America, which is similar to a provision contained in last year's Broomfield amendment.

This legislation also calls for the establishment of a Central American Development Organization, which was recommended by the Kissinger Commission, and an International Advisory Commission for the Caribbean region.

I know how difficult it is for some of my colleagues to support foreign assistance, but I would encourage them to look very closely at this modest proposal we have before us and to think what a small price, what a small investment this program is for promoting a stable and democratic world where U.S. interests are protected. I encourage my colleagues to support

H.R. 1555, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985.

● Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, this week and next, we will be considering H.R. 1555, the Foreign Assistance Act authorization for fiscal year 1986.

With this legislation, we not only have a chance to correct mistakes in our past foreign policy, but also an opportunity to shake up the State Department, which administers foreign aid programs, and force it away from the line of appeasement it has been following.

In time after time, I have witnessed State Department bureaucrats and careerists practice a policy of appeasement to our enemies rather than firmness in following a policy consistent with what is right and in America's best interests.

International incidents in countries like Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan have shown the State Department, as well as the Congress, unwilling to take a tough line toward the enemies of freedom abroad. A State Department policy of appeasement in Cuba helped Castro to power. Inaction in Chile helped a Marxist government to rule that nation.

In the course of following these policies of appeasement and inaction, and adopting a conciliatory approach toward actions and foreign aggressors which damage U.S. interests, the State Department has spent millions and billions of taxpayers' dollars.

Internally, the State Department is a bureaucratic snarl in which U.S. foreign policy is batted about by competing factions, watered down through compromise, indecisiveness or inaction, and emasculated by bureaucrats unable or unwilling to make decisions, exhibit leadership, or take responsibility for our foreign policy.

These are my observations of the sort of operation we are currently funding at that agency. But they are similar to opinions shared by many Americans.

Mr. Chairman, current State Department counselor Edward Derwinski, a former colleague of ours who served 24 years in Congress, recently said, and I quote, "What we need is somebody to shake up the whole damned structure."

We made some progress in this direction when we considered the State Department authorization bill last week. We have some more opportunity to shake up the Department and help correct its policymaking structure in the foreign aid bill before us today.

The bill, as reported by the committee, however, is fatally flawed. In Central America, it adopts the State Department's conciliatory approach, doing more to appease the Soviets and their surrogates in Cuba and Nicaragua than to help our friends in the

region who are struggling to establish strong democracies.

The bill includes numerous conditions on military aid to El Salvador despite the fact that the Salvadoran Government was freely elected, has demonstrated time and again its commitment to improving human rights and is a firm ally of the United States. The requirements go so far as to call on the freely elected Duarte government to enter into dialog with armed opposition forces. With this language, we send the signal that the Marxist/Leninist guerrillas in El Salvador can shoot their way into power.

While we set rigid conditions on aid to our friends, we give virtually free reign for the Sandinistas to spread communism throughout Latin America by prohibiting use of any funds for the Contras. After the House voted 3 weeks ago against aiding the Contras, Commandante Ortega the next day embarked on a victory pilgrimage to Moscow with a request for some \$200 million in aid.

The people throughout Latin America look to the United States for help in fighting Communist aggression. They know that if they do not get the assistance they need, the terror that exists in Nicaragua will spread to their homelands.

This House made a tragic mistake when it voted last month against aiding the Contras. If that vote is sustained and we do not provide immediate help to the freedom fighters, we cannot be serious about supporting those fighting in defense of liberty and freedom anywhere.

We have before us a \$13 billion foreign aid bill. We provide aid to dozens of countries throughout the world, but we seem unwilling or unable to recognize the most serious threat to our security in Central America and provide even modest help to those fighting for democracy there.

We must end the mistaken policy of criticizing our friends at each opportunity and accommodating our enemies—before it's too late. ●

● Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the foreign assistance authorization. Many issues have been and will be raised during the debate on this bill which our Nation must eventually address. The most important of these is whether this Nation has the ability to provide massive amounts of financial assistance to foreign nations during these very difficult economic times. Since first coming to the Congress I have opposed the continuation of these foreign aid programs, because I could not support the giveaway of billions of dollars to other nations while we faced severe economic problems at home.

So long as there is a desperate need in this Nation—elderly who must choose between food and shelter, workers unable to support their fami-

lies, young people without work—I cannot support this massive expenditure of our tax dollars on foreign aid. Can we take dollars from programs that are essential to millions of Americans in order to send them to governments who are hostile to our philosophies and consistently oppose our Government. With this critical shortage of funds, we must put America first.

I deeply regret that in opposing this bill I must vote against aid to Israel, a nation which has suffered greatly in its own defense. Israel is in the throes of its most serious economic crisis since its establishment as a nation. The United States must play an important role during Israel's troubled economic times. I commend the committee for its level of funding to Israel and to Egypt, its leading partner in the peace effort. And I support the restriction on FMS financing for weapons to Jordan.

Israel simply cannot resolve its economic problems by itself without making such draconian cuts as to jeopardize the very security of the state. A clear statement by the U.S. Government of its willingness to increase its assistance would greatly facilitate the difficult decisions that lie before the Israeli Government. The provision of additional aid is very much in our mutual interests. A strong Israel, both economically and militarily, is vital and the United States should generously support Israel as it undergoes this difficult period. ●

● Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1555, the foreign aid authorization for fiscal years 1986 and 1987. In considering this legislation today, I believe that we must ask, can the U.S. Congress really justify the expenditure of over \$13 billion for foreign aid programs in a year in which projected Federal deficits exceed \$200 billion, a year in which we must ask Americans to make significant sacrifices in order to cut the Federal budget and bring the growing deficits under control? Although I recognize the useful role that foreign aid can play in supporting our friends and allies around the world, I believe that it is only right that we apply even greater scrutiny to our foreign aid spending than we apply to our domestic spending needs. Instead, however, while we consider such proposals as reductions in student aid, modifications to Social Security, and the elimination of funding for Amtrak, we are faced with a foreign aid authorization which represents a 5.6-percent nominal increase over the appropriation for fiscal year 1985 and a 64-percent increase over spending in fiscal year 1981.

Mr. Chairman, I find this relentless growth of our foreign aid spending in recent years very troubling. Rather than focusing U.S. aid on the specific needs or problems of friendly nations,

we have come to treat our foreign assistance allocations as an entitlement program: Once an assistance program is begun, its continuation, and in fact, its expansion, seems to be presumed regardless of whether the original objectives of the program are being met. We must recognize the aimless impetus that our foreign assistance programs have assumed and reevaluate the multiplicity of goals that they serve.

Mr. Chairman, in my view, by reducing our spending and working to reduce our national deficit, we can better serve many of those countries which are the beneficiaries of U.S. foreign aid. As long as our deficit remains high, so will interest rates, thus placing a significant burden on nations trying to repay foreign assistance loans from the past. Clearly, deficit reduction must be our foremost priority and foreign aid must be subject to our national economic constraints.

In opposing the trend of foreign assistance generally and H.R. 1555 in particular, I am not advocating U.S. isolationism or the elimination of assistance programs altogether as a tool of U.S. foreign policy. I firmly believe that we have obligations throughout the world that can be served through foreign assistance, whether the need is feeding the starving people of Ethiopia or promoting the struggle of democracy against totalitarianism in Central America, both causes which I strongly support. I believe, however, that U.S. aid allocations should realistically reflect our available resources and should, in general, reward those nations which support our foreign policy objectives, not those who actively oppose them. Mr. Chairman, why should we continue to channel the dollars of American taxpayers to those who use them to counter American interests in the international arena? Why should we provide, as the legislation before us proposes, \$30 million in aid in fiscal year 1986, including military assistance, to the avowed Marxist regime of Mozambique? In my view, proposals such as this clearly demonstrate the unnecessary and even detrimental spending that Congress would accept by passage of H.R. 1555.

I believe as well that elements of this legislation represent an inappropriate intrusion by the House into the foreign policymaking responsibilities of the executive branch. It is the executive branch which possesses the constitutional authority and the resources—represented by the Department of State and its Foreign Service, the intelligence agencies, and the Department of Defense—to develop a fully informed foreign policy. I am opposed, Mr. Chairman, to attempts by this body to impose limitations on the President's foreign policymaking role, attempts reflected in a variety of the

provisions contained in H.R. 1555 such as those creating conditions on assistance to Central America and to Jordan. While Congress must be responsible for determining the levels of spending we can sustain for foreign aid, I believe that the President must retain flexibility in determining the priorities for the use of that aid and in pursuing diplomatic initiatives, flexibility which is impaired by the policy requirements inserted in the foreign aid authorization before us.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, while I recognize that H.R. 1555 does contain some requests for U.S. assistance which are legitimate and in the national interest, I must oppose this legislation based on the objections outlined above. I believe a reconsideration of our approach to foreign assistance is long overdue; until the level of foreign aid spending is drastically reduced to a level consistent with the economic stringency of our time and until a formula is established that effectively rewards our friends and allies, not our enemies, I will continue to oppose funding authorizations for foreign assistance and urge my colleagues to do the same. ●

● Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1555, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985. As in the debate last year over H.R. 5119, the International Security and Development Act of 1984, I do so with reservations. While supporting H.R. 1555, I have a great deal of difficulty with the continued overemphasis on military assistance as opposed to humanitarian and development assistance. The balance in H.R. 1555 between military/security assistance and development and humanitarian assistance, while an improvement in comparison to the administration's request, still contains too much military assistance. Military assistance cannot address the political, economic, and social variables which underlie the drought, malnutrition, lack of health care, and educational opportunity, and plain injustice which torment most of the world and threaten the peace.

I recognize that our military assistance to Israel and Egypt contained in this bill, which would otherwise be but a small item in our overall bloated defense expenditure, is necessarily inserted here in order that this foreign assistance bill gain passage. The real tragedy is that our Nation is yet unwilling to devote more than a token amount to actual development assistance.

This legislation, however, does contain a number of positive features, particularly as it seeks to address human rights and economic development in many areas of the world. It is because of these features and my belief that it is in our national interest to pass a foreign assistance bill that I

have decided to support H.R. 1555. This bill provides at least some policy framework for our assistance programs. I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for his leadership and skill in structuring H.R. 1555 which represents "the art of the possible."

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on Haitian Refugees, I am especially appreciative of the human rights conditionality contained in title VII, section 706, promoting the development of the Haitian people and providing for orderly emigration from Haiti. In this section the Committee on Foreign Affairs expresses its continuing concern over the unsatisfactory human rights situation in Haiti. Specifically, section 706(b)(3) stipulates that assistance may be obligated for Haiti only if the President determines that the Government of Haiti "is making progress toward implementing political reforms which are essential to the development of democracy in Haiti, such as progress toward the establishment of political parties, free elections, free labor unions, and freedom of the press." Section 706 also "provides that to the maximum extent practicable development assistance and economic support fund assistance for Haiti should be provided through private and voluntary organizations."

Having visited Haiti just last month, I can report that section 706 is necessary and helpful to United States foreign policy goals in Haiti. I spent most of my time in the rural areas and was greatly impressed by the resilience, strength, and determination of the small farmers in rural Haiti to help themselves. I saw numerous projects underway on the part of private voluntary agencies, many of them church groups funded by our foreign assistance. I was particularly impressed by the work being done by Catholic organizations, such as IDEA, a grantee of the Inter-American Foundation, which was recently singled out by the Haitian Government for intimidation. Especially encouraging was the improvement in the programs of the Agency for International Development in reaching the poor through indigenous groups. There has been progress made in the past few years, and I can report that with respect to the various reforestation programs, soil conservation programs, and the pig repopulation effort the U.S. taxpayers' money is being well spent. I had earlier requested a General Accounting Office study on our assistance programs to Haiti. I can report, after reviewing the draft copy, that agency's agreement with my assessment after its own extensive and comprehensive onsite investigation.

The AID mission in Haiti is gearing up to assist the Haitian people in addressing the nightmare of an 80-per-

cent illiteracy rate. In a supportive provision section 706 earmarks \$1 million of economic support funds for each fiscal year 1986 and 1987 for literacy programs in Haiti. It is my hope that these funds can be provided to the private educational sector in Haiti in support of educational reform in that sector which presently educates two-thirds of all of those in school in Haiti. The goal of this program should be to support basic education in Haiti with the objective of achieving literacy by the end of the fourth grade. I have been informed by the committee that the language in section 706 would permit the allocation of the earmarked economic support funds to a program such as that mentioned above.

The Haitian people are prodevelopment; they want to improve their lives and those of their children. If given the resources and the freedom to participate in the decisionmaking process of their country, they will develop it. I urge my colleagues to support development assistance to the Haitian people as provided for in section 706 channeling assistance to the maximum extent possible through private and voluntary organizations. The best chance for assuring that assistance reaches the Haitian poor is, in most instances, through private voluntary organizations.

It must also be reported that the whole area of human rights and political freedom suffers from a lack of sustained progress. During my visit, I went to the national penitentiary to meet with political prisoners arrested during a security sweep last November. I was deeply concerned that some of the prisoners with whom I visited at the prison in December 1982 and who had been there since 1979 had still not been charged. I was equally disturbed that those arrested in November 1984 had not been given a trial date, allowed access to legal counsel, or been permitted visits from family members. Most disturbing of all were the continued reports and physical evidence of prisoner abuse at the Cassernes Dessalines prior to transfer to the national penitentiary. Now, I am able to report the encouraging news that these political prisoners, numbering 37 in all, were released on April 29, 1985.

While I was in Haiti, there was a good deal of expectancy among people concerning an announcement by President Jean Claude Duvalier. This announcement made on April 22, 1985, dealt with the establishment of political parties and the creation of an office of Prime Minister. The announcement was vague; the Haitian people have still not been provided with rules for functioning of political parties, and the presidency-for-life is to be maintained. The Prime Minister is to be selected at some future date by

the President from the most popular party as determined in elections for the National Assembly. Whether or not this announcement offers any real possibility for the public policy dialog, accountability, and progress toward democracy and pluralism, which the people of Haiti need and want, will ultimately be determined by the people of Haiti in the coming days.

We in the Congress and our colleagues in the executive branch have an obligation to monitor this process closely as it will impact greatly on our objectives of assisting Haiti toward progress in democratization, promotion of human rights, and development with justice. If it leads to greater participation and accountability, then development prospects will be enhanced and we can revitalize our efforts to assist the great Haitian nation. If it does not succeed, and proves to be an attempt to cosmetically address our concerns while continuing or even increasing repression and the misallocation of resources, then decertification under section 706 should be considered by the executive branch. In the unhappy circumstances where that might be necessary, food assistance under Public Law 480 and all assistance channeled through private and voluntary organizations could be continued. I would hope, however, that in 6 months we could receive a report from the Department of State that can credibly speak of progress toward human rights, democracy, and pluralism. We are at a crucial crossroad in our policy toward Haiti—one that requires increased attention from both the Executive and the Congress.

There are other sections in title VII, "Latin America and the Caribbean," that warrant strong support. Section 718 requests the President of the United States to establish an International Advisory Commission for the Caribbean to end our all too neglectful and patronizing treatment of this vital region. The establishment of such a Commission championed by the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Task Force on the Caribbean, Congressman MERVYN DYMALLY, is long overdue and will help our Nation better address the social, agricultural, educational, and economic problems of the Caribbean.

Section 709 authorizes funding for the Inter-American Foundation and seeks to protect this most valuable institution from politicization, protecting the professionalism of its staff. Having visited with IAF grantees in Haiti, I do not exaggerate in saying that its programs in that country are a model of excellence in working with the poor for self-reliant development and the reduction of dependency.

Section 704 prohibits the use of any funds authorized under H.R. 1555 to military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua.

Section 707 prohibits the use of military assistance for Paraguay unless the President certifies to the Congress that the Government of Paraguay has taken various steps to locate Dr. Joseph Mengele and to correct human rights abuses, specifically torture.

With reference to Africa, the continent with the greatest need for development assistance, title VIII, section 808 authorizes \$94.5 million for fiscal year 1986 and the same for fiscal year 1987 for the Sahel Development Program.

Section 809 authorizes \$4 million in each of the fiscal year 1986 and 1987 for the fledgling African Development Foundation.

As stated earlier, our total of about \$1 billion in development for Africa, particularly sub-Saharan Africa, is woefully inadequate in light of the need. While the American people have been extremely responsive to the need for emergency food assistance, there is an acute need for long-term development assistance. This assistance must be focused on agriculture at levels capable of supporting policy reform and sustained increases in production. There are additional needs in sanitation and health care. As inadequate as are the funding levels under this act for sub-Saharan Africa, I think it imperative that we support the efforts of the Multilateral Development Banks to address the development needs of Africa. With that in mind, I would urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1949, the Multilateral Development Act of 1985, which contains within it a provision to authorize United States participation in the Special Facility of the World Bank for sub-Saharan Africa. This is most important, as United States participation can leverage increased funding for Africa by encouraging the participation of other donor countries. Additionally, H.R. 1949 contains a provision that would authorize United States participation in the fourth replenishment of the Africa Development Fund, the soft loan window of the African Development Bank designed to assist the poorest of African countries. This legislation was affirmatively considered in the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

As a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I am encouraged by title V of H.R. 1555. It authorizes policies and funds designed to enhance our control of the international trade in narcotics, and signals a new toughness in our battle with the No. 1 security problem in our neighborhoods. For example, section 504 provides exemption from the ban on involvement by U.S. personnel in arrest actions in narcotics control efforts abroad.

Sections 509-511 set conditionality on assistance to countries known to produce crops used in the preparation

of narcotics. Conditionality in providing foreign assistance is linked to cooperation of specific countries cited in reducing their cultivation of crops used in the preparation and processing of narcotics.

Other worthy provisions of H.R. 1555 which deserve support are to be found in title VI and title X. Title VI would establish an Undergraduate Scholarship Program for students of limited financial means from developing countries for the purpose of pursuing a course of study at U.S. institutions of higher learning. Congressman MERVYN M. DYMALLY will be introducing an amendment to title VI specifying the inclusion of students from the Caribbean in this program. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Title X would provide increased appropriations for the Peace Corps in fiscal years 1986 and 1987. The level of authorization would be set at \$136.1 million for each of these fiscal years—an increase of \$7.5 million per year over the 1985 appropriation. In providing this increase, the Committee on Foreign Affairs has expressed the position that this increase should be used to support the Peace Corps' African Food Systems Initiative. The committee has also urged the Peace Corps to review its Caribbean programs for the purpose of considering the expansion of its operations in that critical region.

In conclusion and on balance, this legislation imposes a necessary, if imperfect framework for the carrying out of our Foreign Assistance Program and clarifies congressional priorities and areas of concern. Our foreign policy requires such a framework, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1555.

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of title V, the international narcotics control section of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 recently reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. Title V of the bill addresses the shortcomings of our international narcotics control programs overseas. It contains the foreign-assistance-related provisions, as amended, of H.R. 1768, the "International Narcotics Control Act of 1985," introduced by Chairman FASCELL in March of this year.

The major provisions in title V include conditions on United States foreign assistance to Peru, Bolivia, and Jamaica tied to their antinarcotics efforts, an earmark of military assistance funds for U.S. weapons to be installed on antinarcotics aircraft of friendly countries, permission for U.S. agents to be present at overseas narcotics arrest actions and encouraging our military to increase its involvement in antinarcotic measures overseas. These initiatives represent an effort by the Foreign Affairs Commit-

tee and this Congress to demonstrate our frustrations and our resolve regarding the lack of progress in reducing the amounts of illicit drugs being cultivated or processed by narcotics-producing countries which receive foreign aid from the United States.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, since the first of this year four major reports have been issued by various groups whose mandate it is to monitor international drug trafficking. The U.N. International Narcotics Control Board, the State Department, the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control which I chair, as well as the Committee on Foreign Affairs have all reported expanded international production and trafficking of illicit drugs.

Mr. Chairman, the situation regarding illicit narcotics abuse appears to be worsening. We must, this year, brace ourselves against the tide of what was 1984's bumper crop worldwide of opium, coca, and marijuana. We must live with the all too vivid memory of our slain DEA agent and guard against the real threat that those who seek to profit from drugs pose as they get more brazen and more contemptuous of the law.

International drug traffickers have declared war on the United States. Our administration's response to their aggression, a policy mired in equivocation, stuck in diplomatic muck. Yet who suffers while the country waits for the kind of firm action to be taken that brought a halt to the illicit production of opium in Turkey and Mexico in the 1970's? All of us do, and especially our young people.

These drugs are produced by friends overseas. Friends whose governments we support and to whom we provide assistance. To be exact \$57,529,000 for fiscal year 1986 will go to these countries to be applied to their antinarcotics efforts. Yet more illicit narcotics than ever before reach our shores.

Mr. Chairman, I support title V of the foreign aid bill and I commend its authors. Yet I do not believe that in its present form it goes far enough in addressing the concerns I have here outlined and that I am sure we all share. We are past the point of merely criticizing the countries of the world who receive U.S. assistance and then fail to uproot a single coca bush or who put their eradication programs on hold indefinitely. The death and destruction that these drugs bring to this country and around the world take no such hiatus.

I will thus, in the weeks to come offer amendments to title V in order to shore up the weaknesses which I perceive in this legislation. A stronger, firmer, foreign aid package ensures that those receiving our assistance know that a cavalier approach to narcotics control does not sit well with the American Congress and the Ameri-

can people. We have a chance here to send this message. It is a message that has not been forthcoming from the administration. Let us in Congress then seize the initiative and tell our friends around the world in the surest possible way that the unhindered, out of control production of narcotics within their borders is not sufficient consideration for the receipt of our aid.●

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. KANJORSKI] having assumed the chair, Mr. AuCOIN, Chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1555) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Arms Export Control Act, and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to authorize development and security assistance programs for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to proceed for the purpose of inquiring of the acting majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the program for next week is as follows:

The House will meet at noon on Monday and will consider 11 bills on the Suspension Calendar. Recorded votes on suspensions will be postponed until Tuesday.

The 11 bills are as follows:

H.R. 1534, permanent authority for flexible and compressed work schedules;

H.R. 2343, to make certain improvements in veterans compensation programs;

H.R. 2344, to make certain improvements in the VA program that provides assistance to certain disabled veterans;

H.R. 1408, to amend the Emergency Veterans Job Training Act of 1983;

H.R. 505, to improve the delivery of Health Care Services by the VA;

House Joint Resolution 192, National Day of Remembrance to Mans Inhumanity to Man;

H.R. 2456, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization of appropriations for the fiscal year 1985, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the fiscal years 1986 and 87, and for other purposes;

House Resolution 166, expressing the sense of the House re ratification of the Convention of Crime and Genocide, as amended;

House Concurrent Resolution 142, welcoming the Prime Minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi, on the occasion of his official visit to the United States;

H.R. 1997, amending Libraries Services and Construction Act; and

H.R. 2745, amend Internal Revenue Code to simplify imputed interest rules.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon and will consider the Private Calendar. Following any postponed recorded votes on suspensions debated on Monday, the House will consider H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985, subject to a rule being granted.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week the House will meet at 10 a.m. and will consider the budget resolution for fiscal year 1986.

Mr. MICHEL. If I might inquire, those votes on suspensions on Tuesday would be up first, before consideration of the Anti-Apartheid Act; is that correct?

Mr. COELHO. That is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. Does the gentleman have any idea, on the Anti-Apartheid Act, how many amendments were made under the rule? Did they conclude, informally, the act?

Mr. COELHO. If the gentleman will yield, we do not know exactly how many amendments, but we understand it will take about 6 hours.

Mr. MICHEL. And would that suggest that we would attempt, then, to finish that legislation, no matter how late on Tuesday?

Mr. COELHO. Our intentions at this point are to complete the bill on Tuesday.

Mr. MICHEL. And then we would have the rule on the budget resolution the first thing on Wednesday, I assume.

Mr. COELHO. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct. And as the gentleman knows, under the rules, the budget gets 10 hours of general debate, so we would complete the general debate on Wednesday for the budget resolution.

Mr. MICHEL. And then depending upon the number of amendments

made in order, we would be under the amending process on Thursday on the budget resolution?

Mr. COELHO. If the gentleman will yield, our intent is to vote on Thursday on the budget amendments and to hopefully conclude on Thursday, if we can get through at a reasonable hour. But our intentions are to complete it on Thursday.

□ 1150

Mr. MICHEL. Of course, that is prior to our Memorial Day normal recess period where Members are obliged to make Memorial Day speeches and appearances, usually back home. So, I would imagine the get-away time is, hopefully, to be as early as possible on Thursday to facilitate Members departing town.

Is that correct?

Mr. COELHO. If the gentleman will yield, that is our intent. Of course, depending, as the gentleman knows, on the number of amendments and discussion; but that is our intent.

Mr. MICHEL. Just one more clarification. It would not be the intention on the majority side to go beyond general debate on the budget resolution on Wednesday; we would not get to the amending stage under any circumstances Wednesday; would we or would we not?

Mr. COELHO. If the gentleman will yield, our intent at this point is to only do general debate because it is 10 hours, and then on Thursday, start with the amendments that have been made in order.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 20, 1985

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CENTRAL AMERICA: A DOSE OF REALITY

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, whenever a government sets on a vague course of action, it takes no great skill to see that lack of direction leads to misdirection, and misdirection leads to disaster.

In Nicaragua, the Central Intelligence Agency was given a vague mission. Congress thought that the Intelligence Agency was supposed to build up a force to interdict arms supplies that supposedly were going from Nicaragua to El Salvador. The CIA, however, apparently thought that its mission was to try and overthrow the Nicaraguan Government. President Reagan thinks that the job is to make the Sandinistas cry uncle.

Sure enough, it was not long before uncontrolled actions grew up in the midst of the policy vacuum. The CIA built a much larger force than Congress had envisioned, and that force began acting far beyond the scope of anything that Congress had authorized, and indeed far beyond the specific limits set out in the Boland amendments. The lack of direction clearly permitted the CIA to drift out of control, with results that strengthened the Sandinistas, weakened legitimate opposition to the regime, and further tarnished whatever good name our country had remaining in Nicaragua.

In this week's news, we see further confirmation of how a vague policy, carried out by proxies, can do more harm than good.

President Reagan on April 3, last year, signed papers to authorize the CIA to carry out counterterrorist actions, both of a preemptive and retaliatory nature. Sure enough, the action soon came down to seeking revenge in that revenge-ridden holocaust that is called Lebanon. And what happened?

We supported operations that we did not control, but for which our Government would be—and has been—held responsible. The CIA worked with Lebanese intelligence, which in turn worked through proxies of their own, who in turn had their own private agenda. These proxies in the third or fourth degree succeeded in killing 80 people in a car bombing, but missed their target. It was a senseless, indefensible slaughter. It killed dozens of innocent people, and probably ended up doing more to promote than to suppress terrorism.

When are we going to learn? When are we going to learn that wishful thinking is no substitute for clear policy direction? When are we going to learn that violent, clandestine activity has to be controlled in the closest possible way; that you cannot substitute blood for brains, and that it is not pos-

sible to do through thugs that which must be done through thought?

It was not James Bond manning the speed boats that mined the harbors in Managua, and in the process undermined the Sandinista opposition. It was not the heroes of "Mission Impossible" who set out to terrorize the Nicaraguan countryside. It wasn't even the Keystone Cops. No, this is the real world, and in that real world, we have seen repeatedly that working through proxies, through violence, and through undefined policy, we have not harmed our enemies and opponents so much as strengthened them and harmed ourselves.

TO PROVIDE MEDICARE COVER- AGE FOR THERAPEUTIC FOOT- WEAR NECESSITATED BY CON- DITIONS RESULTING FROM DI- ABETES

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to introduce a bill which would provide Medicare coverage of costs for therapeutic shoes for diabetic individuals who suffer from severe diabetes-related foot disease.

There are approximately 5½ million diabetics in the United States. It is estimated that about 2.1 million are 65 and over and Medicare eligible.

Mr. Speaker, many people are unaware that diabetics often suffer from peripheral neuropathy or loss of feeling or sensation. This leads to repeated injury or trauma to the extremities resulting in ulceration and infections.

Diabetics also suffer from peripheral vascular disease. This disease causes the blood supply to the lower extremities to be severely diminished. With the diminished blood supply, healing of ulcers and infections is impaired, even prevented. The result is that gangrene will occur and amputation is necessitated.

Mr. Speaker, amputations are much more common among diabetics than the general population. It is estimated that each year 40,000 diabetics are required to have a lower extremity amputation. Of these, anywhere from 10,000 to 16,000 are age 65 or over.

Amputation could be prevented, however, in as many as 50 to 75 percent of affected individuals if proper foot care were available. Proper foot care involves patient education and, where foot disease is only mild, the use of extra-depth shoes and plastizote inserts. For patients with severe diabetic foot disease, specifically designed therapeutic shoes are necessary. It is these specially designed shoes that I, along with the American Diabetes As-

sociation, am proposing be made part of the Medicare Program.

It is estimated that at least 5 percent of diabetics suffer some form of severe diabetic foot disease, including foot deformity and ulceration. These individuals are at a great risk for amputations.

An amputation, Mr. Speaker, can cost Medicare anywhere from \$10,000 to \$16,000 per patient. If these high risk individuals had properly fitting therapeutic shoes, at least 40 percent of these amputations could be prevented.

The average cost of a pair of specially fitted therapeutic shoes is approximately \$350. That seemingly high cost is a significant barrier to their acquisition by Medicare beneficiaries who generally must live on fixed incomes. If Medicare were to pay 80 percent of the cost of these shoes for diabetes-related beneficiaries needing them, that would be about \$280 per pair per year. If, then, the 105,000 Medicare beneficiaries—5 percent of 2.1 million—qualified for shoes, the potential cost to the Medicare system would be approximately \$30 million.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of providing these shoes would be offset against the savings created by amputations prevented. Even if the availability of shoes lowered the amputation rate by only 40 percent, savings are predicted to be at least \$30 million or more. This figure does not even reflect the other costs associated with diabetic foot disease—hospitalization for surgery on lesions, debridement of ulcers, et cetera—which could also be prevented. Nor does it reflect the added costs incurred by the Social Security system associated with permanent disability due to amputation.

In order to ensure that this benefit is properly utilized, the bill also provides that anyone who receives therapeutic shoes be certified by a physician as being involved in a comprehensive plan of care for all aspects of their disease. Thus, the bill protects against possible abuse or misuse.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I introduce today was developed in consultation with the American Diabetes Association and provides Congress with the opportunity to improve the quality of life for diabetics while reducing costs incurred by the Medicare system.

ABUSES OF SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, there has been some debate around the House for a period of time as to whether or not Members ought to come to the floor and actually participate in debate, and actually talk about

subjects out here on the floor during special order time.

In fact, we have had the majority, on several occasions, question whether or not the minority should in fact utilize this time. The reason why the minority often utilizes the time is because these special orders are one of the few periods during the legislative day when the minority can get time to discuss the issues that it wants to discuss here on the House floor.

Other than that, the legislative schedule is controlled by the majority and only those issues that the majority designs for the House to discuss are the issues before us. We think it is important from time to time to define for the American people issues as seen from the perspective of the minority party, which got nearly half the votes in the last election for Congress. So, it is important I think that we have the debate on the House floor which is in fact oriented sometimes from the minority side as well.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WHEAT].

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1460, ANTI-APARTHEID ACT OF 1985

Mr. WHEAT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-131) on the resolution (H. Res. 174) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1460) to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman was most kind in the Rules Committee at helping us achieve a rule that the minority will be able to offer a substitute under, and I thank the gentleman for that.

Mr. Speaker, to go back to the issue on the special order, what we have seen happening, however, is the majority, from time to time, has decided that special orders, because they are coming from the minority viewpoint, are therefore not conducive to their legislative process and have raised objections to them.

Among the objections they have raised from time to time is that when minority Members are on the floor taking special order time, that we are costing the taxpayers' money. Now, that never seems to be an issue when majority Members are taking the time. In fact, a review of special order time during this Congress will reveal that there are majority Members who have taken far more time in special orders than any Member of the minority has.

The majority party, and particularly through the Democratic Congressional Committee, has in fact issued press releases into Members' districts accusing

them of wasting taxpayers' money by coming to the floor to debate.

Let me make the point that, indeed, there are some costs that are associated with being on the floor debating issues. I think the healthiest part of the legislative process is Members who are willing to come here to the floor and allow their viewpoints to be challenged. As I stand here today talking, if there is somebody that wants to take exception to what I am saying, they are perfectly able to come to the floor, I will be glad to yield to them and we will debate the issue.

That is somewhat different, I would say, than the issues that arise by people taking material that they have preprinted and stick it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That also costs the taxpayers. As a matter of fact, in discussions with the Clerk, I have found out that that is where most of the expense comes from, whether it is talking on the House floor or whether or not it is inserting material in the RECORD.

The real question of cost to the taxpayers is how much it costs to print the RECORD, and that insertions are in fact the expensive part of what we do here in the House.

I would say that those people who do not allow their viewpoints to be challenged by simply sticking stuff into the RECORD are in fact the ones who are abusing the legislative process. What they end up with is something which is printed, which appears to be what was said on the House floor, which is often represented to the public as something which was said on the House floor, but in fact was never spoken, and so therefore, could never be challenged. So they are not asked to defend those things which they are saying. Whereas, someone discussing the issue on the floor is in a position of having to defend what it is they are saying.

I happen to think that the legislative process is furthered by people who are willing to have their viewpoints challenged. I am disappointed from time to time that people who, on the outside, will raise criticisms, refuse to come to the House floor and make those criticisms here where someone might be able to challenge them.

□ 1200

But the issue of cost, then, does, I think, raise questions in the public mind and so, therefore, need to be defined because if, in fact, the Democratic Congressional Committee is right in the press releases that they are sending out to people's districts, that in fact this business of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is very costly, then it seems to me that the Democratic Congressional Committee has an obligation, through the majority party, to bring

to the floor a rule which stops the abuse of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There are a number of abuses of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We had one on the floor the other day, talking about the fact that the Members have a right to lie in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the ability to revise and extend. I think that is a real problem.

But in this case, the issue is this: Should Members be allowed to put large volumes of material into the RECORD that was never spoken on the House floor and thereby pass the cost along to the taxpayers? The Democratic Congressional Committee, the campaign arm of the majority party in this House, has said in the press release that they issued in order to criticize Members of the minority side, that it costs \$6,500 per hour for the cost of printing additional pages into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

If you take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, you will find that each hour of time is about 6½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so, therefore, what the Democratic Congressional Committee is saying is that it costs somewhere between \$900 and \$1,000 per page to print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have asked the Clerk, and the Clerk says that that is just a total phony figure; that that is not, in fact, the cost of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is actually about half that amount to print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But that is what the Democratic Congressional Committee has to say. I assume that they did not mean to lie, but the fact is that their release says \$6,500 per hour, and it takes about 6½ pages of the RECORD to consume an hour.

So if they are right, then we went and did a little more research. I had a young lady over at the Republican Study Committee by the name of Krista West go back through and find out how many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there were since the beginning of this Congress, between January 3 and May 7 the Democrats have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, how much material had the Democrats simply put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now, not back in the Extensions of Remarks in the back that is provided for that, that is costly, too, but how much in the body of the RECORD while the House is going on in special orders, during debate, where they have inserted material into the RECORD. How much have Democrats put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over that period of time at a cost that the Democratic Congressional Committee says is nearly \$1,000 per page, at least \$900?

What I find is that there are over 250 pages of such material that have been put into the RECORD. In other words, the Democrats who complain about the cost of the minority in

printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have, in fact, themselves cost the taxpayers nearly a quarter of a million dollars for printing material that they refuse to say on the House floor; that they refuse to have challenged as a part of the debate process on the House floor; that they simply stuck into the RECORD without having it debated on the House floor.

That is their figure. They say that it cost \$900 to \$1,000 a page, and I counted up the pages through the Republican study group's work, and we found the 250 pages.

My question is: Why is that a responsible action if, in fact, what they are going to do is put out these kinds of press releases, make these kinds of claims about cost, why is it a responsible action for them, then, to be sticking this material into the RECORD and costing the taxpayers. Should not a reform take place that stops this abuse if, in fact, it does as the Democratic Congressional Committee claims, costs \$900 to \$1,000 a page for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I would far prefer, as a Member who is committed to the debate process in the House, that those Members come out on the floor, speak their minds, have their viewpoints challenged, and make certain that what is said is, in fact, the reality of debate rather than the phoniness of debate that takes place when we are simply inserting material into the RECORD, evidently at great cost to the taxpayers, according to the Democratic Congressional Committee.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to my good friend from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee on which I serve.

Mr. WEISS. I wonder if he would yield to me so that I could ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes for a discussion of revenue sharing that the gentleman himself may want to participate in.

Mr. WALKER. I would be very happy to yield some time to the gentleman to do that.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to have 5 minutes to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matters therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. STALLINGS]. After the present special order, that request would be in order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I can simply yield to the gentleman, and he can talk about whatever he wants, can he not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WEISS. I would appreciate that.

Mr. WALKER. I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman to make any comments that he might wish to make relative to revenue sharing.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

Mr. WEISS. I very much appreciate my distinguished colleague yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak on behalf of the general revenue sharing very briefly because I know that the budget resolution will be coming before this body as of next week, and that there is a recommendation probably forthcoming which will adversely affect the general-revenue sharing program, and before that becomes finalized I thought that perhaps a few minutes of discussion might be in order.

General revenue sharing is a program which has operated successfully since 1972, because of strong bipartisan support in both Houses of the Congress. It is the most efficient, fair, and cost-effective grant program that the Federal Government operates.

Each year, less than one-tenth of 1 percent of program funds goes to administration. With the remainder going directly for vital public services such as police, fire, ambulance, education, and health care. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is the ranking member on the subcommittee, together with other members of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources of the Government Operations Committee, had occasion, earlier this year, to hold field hearings across the country. We held hearings in Cedar Rapids, IA. We had representatives, that is mayors, supervisors of various counties from five different States.

We held hearings in Austin, TX; we held hearings in Charleston, WV; we held hearings in Boston, MA, in addition to holding hearings in Washington, DC. The story was the same, in location after location from mayors of big cities and small towns and everything in between.

County supervisors, representing some 39,000 units of government receiving revenue-sharing assistance based on a formula which makes the automatic determination as to what communities are entitled to, without the necessity of paperwork having to be engaged in. In many instances, these communities get not another nickel or dime of Federal funds except what they get from the revenue-sharing program.

We were told, without exception, that if the revenue sharing programs are cut that they will have only two choices at the localities. They can

either cut services or they can increase taxes, and the increase in taxes will go on, in most instances, real estate, on real property, on people's homes and farms and business properties that they own. The fact is that in most communities they are already paying real estate taxes up to the very top level permissible, and in many States the communities cannot levy greater taxes because there are provisions of the law which in essence put a limitation on how much of an increase in real estate taxes there can be.

Thirty percent of the moneys that go for the revenue-sharing program go for the basic services of police and fire, so that this is not a matter of using these moneys for frills. We had testimony from small town mayors. I remember one community of maybe 1,200 people where the mayor testified that they took the couple of thousand dollars that they received from the revenue-sharing program, bought materials, and then volunteers from that small community themselves used the materials to repair the roof of the town hall. We had testimony from communities that do not have water yet brought to them, where they have used revenue sharing to install water systems.

The revenue-sharing program has been a very useful, effective, essential portion of the Federal fiscal relationship with the localities for these past 13 years or so. It has eroded, as a matter of fact, some 50 percent in value because there has been no increase in the revenue-sharing program since its inception.

□ 1210

The program was never intended as a surplus-sharing program. People tell us, "Well, we have deficits now, so we can't share what we don't have, deficits." The fact is that the revenue-sharing program was begun under the Nixon administration at a time of Federal deficits, and Federal deficits have existed in each of the years in which the program has been reauthorized.

There is often a sort of an attitude that says, "Why should we, the Federal Government, in our largesse give them, the localities, our money?" Mr. Speaker, that has it all upside down. It is not our moneys. Every single dollar that the Federal Government collects comes from people who live in our hometowns, in our constituencies. The Federal Government takes a great deal of money from those localities. At the same time the Federal Government mandates programs, and I think rightly, but nonetheless the Federal Government mandates programs, whether they be air quality or water quality or access for disabled and handicapped people to public places or updating correctional facilities. We mandate those programs on the communities, and what the revenue-sharing

program is intended to do is in a very small part to compensate or to reimburse those localities for the money they have expended on the basis of Federal mandates.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the House would follow the suit of the Senate with regard to the Federal revenue-sharing program and in essence freeze the revenue-sharing program. What the Senate budget resolution does is provide for funding at the same level. I think that the people of this country should have the right to expect no less from the House of Representatives, and I hope that in the course of the debates next week we will in fact be able to persuade our colleagues that revenue sharing is not a frill, that it is not a frivolous expenditure of moneys. It is moneys that go for the most basic and essential needs of the people back home.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding at this time to me.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I participated in some of those hearings with him, and I would say the gentleman well represents the case that was made to the subcommittee by constituents across this country.

I think one point that the gentleman made needs to be reemphasized. That is that indeed there are Federal resources being spent on the revenue-sharing program. We are not in debate over that issue. The question is whether or not those resources are wisely spent in this kind of a discretionary program.

I think that the one case that is very clear on this is that we as the Federal Government, as we have come more and more into budget-crunch situations, have tended to pass on more and more mandates to local governments. We have tended to say to local governments, "We regard this as being something that is the law of the land, something that needs to be done. We don't have the money to do it. You do it." And we pass on those mandates that then become extremely costly to local governments.

The only discretionary money, the only discretionary resources that come from the Federal Government in order to meet those mandates come in the revenue-sharing program, and the way most of these communities have reacted to the mandates passed on by the Federal Government is to use revenue-sharing money in order to meet those mandatory obligations.

In my mind, if we are going to eliminate the revenue-sharing money—and there are people around here who will make a strong case in that regard—if we are going to do that, it seems to me we ought to have an accompanying bill with that, and that is a bill that eliminates all the mandates we passed along to those same governments. I do

not think that we can say that we are going to have it both ways, that we can impose mandates across this country and then not provide the resources with which to meet the mandates. I think that becomes a ludicrous policy for this Congress to pursue.

If we are going to withdraw the resources, then let us withdraw the mandates, too, and let local governments meet their own locally determined priorities with their own resources and not impose our priorities on those resources. If we are going to impose priorities on them, then we ought to provide at least a modicum of resources with which to meet the priorities that we have passed on as obligations.

We heard that in a number of instances from local communities, that that is a major problem for them, that the kind of mandates the Federal Government imposes is indeed a problem for local governments. I think that that makes one of the clearest cases that is available for a continuation of the revenue-sharing program, even in a budget-crunch kind of situation.

I am one who is pretty sensitive to the whole business of the deficit, but I think that the way in which we manage programs around here is also a deficit question, and we have some horribly managed programs where we have attempted to micromanage things out of Washington that cost us great gobs of money. But here we have a program that costs us next to nothing to administer and in fact is helping to pick up mandates that we as the Federal Government would have to pick up otherwise, and does so at a cost which we have been able to freeze for a number of years. It does not make sense to wipe out the most efficient programs in order to keep the most ineffective programs. That to me is a kind of a crazy way to proceed.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and he is quite right in saying that the Federal Government gets a tremendous bargain. We nowhere near compensate the local governments at the local level for the mandates that they fulfill. So it seems to me that at a time when we keep on talking about shifting burdens to the local governments and shifting resources to them to meet those burdens, for us to take away one of the very few programs that in fact gives them resources from the Federal Government does not make sense at all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I certainly hope that if we end up with a budgetary program—and we all are going to have to face tough decisions on this, me as well as the gentleman—at least if we face the budgetary crunch of having to cut off those

funds, we will include with that language that withdraws all the mandates that we have put on local government, because at that point we will have at least partially compensated them for the loss of the resource, but also will have assured that in losing the resource they are not tied to Federal mandates that they cannot meet with local moneys.

This has become something of a potpourri of a special order, with a whole series of questions we have addressed here during the time.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting here listening to some of the discussion. I want to try to take a little different tack on this issue of revenue sharing.

I think it is fine if we freeze revenue sharing, but the fact is that we have to evaluate what we spend money on in this country at the Federal level, what is important and what we cut. We have an expenditure request from the President, from the Senate, and probably from the House that will far exceed the revenues we have available to meet it, and so we have to decide where the cuts come from.

I think that philosophically the Reagan administration, since the day it took office, has really decided it wants to move back to the notion that that Government which governs least governs best, and local government is better able to make decisions about these local issues than we are.

I have found in the last dozen or 15 years that the growth of programs by which one level of government raises money and then sends it to another level of government and says, "You spend it" breeds, in some instances, at least the most irresponsible of public spending. Generally speaking, when you have public officials who are required to raise the revenues and then required to oversee their expenditure, you breed, it seems to me, the most efficient kind of allocation of resources.

By that I am not suggesting that all EDA, all UDAG, all community development grants, and all revenue sharing is bad. But I am saying this: I think there was an explosion of programs that were developed in Congress in the last decade, especially or the last dozen years that said: "Raise the money here because it is easy to raise the money, send it back there, and you go ahead and spend it back there."

For that reason, for example, in my home State, 1,500 miles from any major body of water, or any ocean, we have a swimming pool with a wave machine. Why? Why do we have a wave machine that has a bellows at one end and a beachhead at the other and gives 2-foot to 3-foot waves in the middle of summer? Well, not because

the folks back home said: "We really want to spend our money on that." It was because there was some Federal money in a Federal program, and they said: "You build this swimming pool in this neighborhood, and you have this extra money, so you go ahead and buy a wave machine for it."

That is just one example of what exists all around this country.

I am just saying that when you take a look at our responsibilities, the revenues we have and the spending needs we have, including the highest priority needs, that is, feeding the hungry, helping the disadvantaged, educating the American people, and so on, when you make those choices, I think you need to make them in a philosophical framework of deciding how we most effectively spend money that meets the most critical needs. When we talk about revenue sharing, or UDAG, or EDA, or any the other programs, we have to continually keep that in mind.

All the mayors and others have contacted me, and I understand they have contacted all of us about revenue sharing. Again I am not saying that we have to zero revenue sharing out tomorrow. But I recall when revenue sharing was enacted in Congress—I was not here at the time—the whole underlying theory of revenue sharing was always, at its genesis in the 1960's and leading up to its enactment in the 1970's, that because of a progressive tax system interacting on an economy such as ours, we would have fiscal drag if we did not yield back those surpluses of revenue that we collect in the long term at the Federal level.

□ 1220

Well, of course, the surpluses have never materialized and therefore we need never have worried about fiscal drag resulting from surpluses.

But I wanted to raise those points simply in the context of the discussion that the gentleman was having about revenue sharing, because it is even broader than that. It deals with a lot of programs that send money elsewhere, where one government collects it and the other government spends it.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman makes a legitimate point, and it is in fact many of the points that the opposition will make, but I think the gentleman maybe missed my point and that is the fact that we do not have a system in this country at the present time which is allowing local officials to use local resources for locally determined priorities. What we have in this country in too many instances is a system which allows local officials to raise local resources; in other words, raise local taxes to meet mandates imposed on them by State and Federal governments.

I think in that kind of climate that the Federal and State governments have some obligation to fund the pri-

orities that they are mandating on local officials.

I can be fairly comfortable with eliminating a revenue-sharing program in a climate where the Federal Government was not imposing mandates upon local governments, telling them: "You assume the costs, but we don't give you any of the money." I could be reasonably comfortable with that, but the problem is that that is not the situation. In fact, during the growth period that the gentleman has talked about of a lot of these locally derived programs, we have not only begun spending some money for them, we have sent back a minimal amount of money for the amount of mandate that we have tied to that money.

My point is this, that if in fact we want to get rid of revenue sharing, we want to get rid of UDAG's, and community block grants, and a lot of these programs, and I personally could endorse getting rid of a number of them, but then at that point let us not tell local officials that they have got to commit local resources to doing what we tell them to do. Let us make certain that they can do with that money what they determine should be done, rather than meeting mandates as prescribed from Washington. Until we get that kind of balance, it seems to me then we are really doing something which is destructive of local government when we say to them: "There are no Federal resources, but you will have to meet our mandates." That to me causes all kinds of dislocations and all kinds of problems.

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me say that I accept the premise of some of what the gentleman says. I understand that. We do at times say: "Here is your requirement, local government, but it is not our business to deal with the resource question."

I understand the unfairness of that. I understand the predicament that puts some of the local officials in and in some cases that is unwarranted.

The gentleman's suggestion that we have to map some of these things is one that I understand and accept.

On the other hand, the gentleman knows and I know, I grew up in a town of several hundred people. I recall when that town decided whether or not it wanted to pave its streets. There was a big question, because you know, we had gravel streets in our town. It was a question for the townspeople, whether or not they wanted to commit that kind of resource. In course, in later years it has not been that difficult a question because there has always been a program that comes from someplace else that will send money to that town. You do not have to go through this decisionmaking.

What do you want to spend your money on? Some of those communities were dumping raw sewage upstream where the kids were swimming downriver. Well, you know, ultimately the Government said: "You can't do that. You have got to treat that sewage," and there are restrictions. So in those cases the Government said: "Here is some money to do it."

But we also said: "It's also part of your responsibility, local government, to handle those affairs because you do collect a property tax and have a local revenue base."

I accept part of the gentleman's premise and I think this is a constructive dialog. I am just saying that it is not an easy question to answer precisely where these resources ought to be cut or how much we are to offer, where it ought to stop; but I am saying that it is important.

Let me just say also that I am not very complimentary of President Reagan's leadership on this floor, for a lot of good reasons, I think, but I do compliment him for his leadership since 1980 in stopping the explosion of some of these kinds of programs, to say: "Wait a second, let's take a look at what we are doing. Are we just sending checks all over and saying we raised it, you go ahead and spend it?"

I compliment the President for saying: "Let's start putting the brakes on some of those kinds of things."

Mr. WALKER. Well, I personally think that it would be very valuable to start a turnback of responsibility, as well as resources, and that we would do a great deal for the empowerment of local government and for the empowerment of local people by beginning a process that gets the Federal Government out of a lot of these things and allows resources to be developed at the local level; but it really does strike me as puzzling that we have a Congress that is willing to eliminate those programs that are discretionary in nature, while we continue to fund programs which are far more arbitrary in nature. I think that exactly the reverse should be true.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

You can always find a wave machine, a wavemaking machine, to wave in an effort to try to discredit a program which benefits 329,000 communities.

The fact that some community leaders do irresponsible things should not be a justification for eliminating a program where the overwhelming vast percentage, in fact, it is used for the most basic of community services, in many instances to meet Federal mandates, as the gentleman has said.

Mr. WALKER. Well, if the gentleman would allow me to reclaim my time for just a moment, as the gentleman pointed out in his remarks, and it is absolutely true, and the testimony shows it, and the facts and figures show it, there can be no doubt about it, where the money from revenue sharing goes is for fire protection and law enforcement. The vast bulk of the money goes into those particular elements, so it really is a question of public safety that is largely involved in the revenue-sharing program.

The gentleman is right. You can find abuses. I am very good at coming up with abuses in programs around here and you can find them all the time; but we should understand that in the case of revenue sharing, I have no doubt there are abuses. I have no doubt that you can come up with a laundry list of them.

We also hear about rich communities that are getting revenue-sharing money, and that is in fact the case, just as there are millionaires who get Social Security checks and we do not talk about eliminating the Social Security Program because some millionaires get checks out of it.

There is really a need to look at what the bulk of the money goes for and if in fact you are against doing some additional crime fighting and you are against local fire companies having some additional resources available to them, you may in fact take the position that revenue sharing has not worked; but if you look at the realities, the fact is realities say it is public safety that is most enhanced by what we do with revenue sharing.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WEISS. The fact is that the communities are required by law and do so as a matter of practice of holding public hearings in which they ask the community to come forward and tell us how we ought to spend this money, whether we get \$2,000, or \$15,000, or \$35,000, or in the millions in some of the larger communities. The decisionmaking really is made by the leaders of those communities on the basis of what their constituencies tell them.

We have small county representatives who came and told us that under State law they are held responsible for providing ultimate support and shelter for elderly people without any other means in their communities. Well, where do they get the money from? The only way they are able to supply the necessary programs now is to take revenue-sharing funds.

What happens if in fact that money is taken away from them? In many instances they cannot raise taxes any more because the State law prohibits them from increasing real estate taxes. The State still insists that they

provide the services, so what they will have to do is they will have to cut someplace else. Maybe they will reduce the number of policemen or firemen they have in their communities.

Again what we are talking about are basic needs in society. It is ironic, it seems to me, for us to take a situation where we have said categorical programs really do not make as much sense as we thought they did because the Federal Government in those instances tries to tell localities how to spend their money.

So, OK, revenue sharing is discretionary. It says: "You make your determination as to where you use the money," and then we go ahead and say: "Oh, but we are raising the taxes and letting you spend the money."

It is an argument that you can play both sides against the middle for a long time, but ultimately something has to give.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman and we go back to the statement of the gentleman from North Dakota when he raised the question of one of the major priorities on his list. I might have put defense on the list, too; but one of the major priorities on his list was education.

The fact is that education takes place in this country mainly at the local level and what we have had happening as a result of several categories of programs is that we have been mandating more and more on those local units, local school districts, with relatively little in the way of resources.

Revenue sharing, although it has to be in some cases through the backdoor method, another major area of revenue sharing has been to get money into the education communities. In some cases it has gone and helped library systems. There have been various ways of doing it; but if you add the educational element into the public safety element, you have really begun to speak to some of the needs that the gentleman from North Dakota himself specified as being major national goals, that in fact are being implemented at the local level.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one final comment, it has been said before and it is worth saying again, there is no free lunch. If people think here in this body that by eliminating a program like revenue sharing you are ultimately going to get off without consequences, we are kidding ourselves.

□ 1230

What is going to have to happen is either vital services are cut at home or your citizens, your constituents back home are going to be asked to pay increased real estate property taxes, and

ultimately they will know who is responsible for those cuts in services and for those increases in property taxes.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is right. And I think it is also that there is a need to recognize that through discretionary programs it is in fact possible to begin the process of reducing Federal commitments while getting positive results out in the country. In the case of revenue sharing we know very well that the Revenue-Sharing Program has not been increased at all for a number of years. It has been held frozen, not just for the last couple of years when freeze has been a big item in Washington, but it has been frozen for most of the life of the program. So we are talking about a program that shows that with reducing resources you can still meet a broad base of legitimate needs.

If you put that together with what we did in education, and the gentleman and I are not wholly in agreement on this, I know, but with the educational block grants that went into, for example, to fund the great bulk of the country, the school districts across the country where we were able to deliver more money with the block grant to those school districts than we had delivered in the past.

Mr. WEISS. The gentleman is right, we do not necessarily agree on that.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman has some concern about the urban school districts. But the fact is, what I am saying is for the majority of school districts in the country under chapter 2 they got more money under chapter 2 than they had gotten before because we did eliminate some of the bureaucracy at the Federal level and we forced a State passthrough mechanism that assured the delivery of funds.

I think that a case can be made in that case, too; we showed that despite the fact that the funding levels were either held even or cut back in a couple of instances that the delivery of money to the school districts was enhanced, and I think we are beginning to see some examples of that.

It is a shame to step in and cut out some of the more efficient ways of delivering money.

Mr. WEISS. If I may make just one more point on the education point, the program I think perhaps that is most relevant is the Congress passed legislation mandating that each child receive equivalent educational programs and resources regardless of the special education needs of children within our communities. And the Congress said at the time that they reinforced that mandate to the localities by they were going to make sure that we provided them with the resources to meet the needs of those kids.

Well, not only did we never provide what we promised that we would, but

in those instances where revenue sharing has been used, in New York City, for example, 7,000 teachers had their salaries paid for out of revenue-sharing funds. Now we are saying that is going out.

You know we are not going to cut 7,000 teachers. But what it will mean is that we will be cutting some police people, some fire people, some health service people, sanitation people, to make up for the revenue-sharing funds that are lost.

Mr. WALKER. That is one of the best points that we could possibly make about the system of mandates, because that has been a very, very expensive program, not that it is not a worthwhile program. But when you start talking about equivalent education, and you realize the broad range of people that affects and how that affects school districts where they may have one or two children with special handicaps, where they have to make multimillion-dollar decisions with regard to building access and a number of things in order to accommodate those couple of kids, when you have that mandate from the Federal Government you are imposing tremendous costs often upon school systems. And the gentleman is absolutely right. We have got to be willing then to follow our mandate with resources.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman very much.

As I said a couple of minutes ago, this special order is somewhat of a potpourri. But I had made the point earlier with regard to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD abuse that I think needs to be aired, and I have fairly substantially made that point.

But I think maybe what we want to do is perhaps move into another issue that will be coming on the floor next week where I have had some involvement, and a couple of the gentlemen on the floor with me have had some involvement over the last several months, and one where we feel very strongly that an approach has to be taken that will in fact enhance U.S. policy rather than detract from U.S. policy. And that is the whole issue of what do we do about apartheid in South Africa.

The gentlemen who are on the floor with me here have in a variety of ways demonstrated that there is in fact a conservative and a Republican viewpoint on this issue which is vehemently antiapartheid but also has some belief that we are about to take some actions in this body that might in fact undercut our ability to deal with that abhorrent system rather than enhance our ability to deal with that system.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. Let me yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I will be doing a special order this afternoon on specifically the issue of how a free society can have an effective foreign policy in a dangerous world. And I am going to talk about three different levels of difficulty, the difficulties of Leninism and the Soviet Union, the difficulties of terrorism, including the recent disaster in Philadelphia, and finally the difficulties of dealing with States which are not a direct threat to the United States but whose policies are abhorrent.

I would say to the gentleman that in a sense the text I want to talk about, because I think the debate next week will not be about South Africa, and I think the debate next week will be about how America is effective, my text is from Abba Eban and his new book "The New Diplomacy of International Affairs in the Modern Age, 1983."

As the gentleman knows, Abba Eban was the remarkably articulate and persuasive Israeli Foreign Minister for many years, and in his new book he said, and I quote from page 68:

The speed and vigor with which Carter supported the tide of change obscured an essential question. Was any regime in the world so oppressive that it was incapable of becoming more so? The dilemma was well illustrated in Iran and Nicaragua. When the United States weakened a pro-Western dictatorship the end result was not a pro-Western democracy but an anti-Western despotism. The Ayatollah Khomeini was no improvement on the Shah. This tends to support the view that the United States should determine its relations with other nations in accordance with their contribution to stability rather than by reference to their domestic conduct.

The point I want to make is that the former Foreign Minister of Israel is saying to our liberal friends, people I have characterized sadly in foreign policy as being ostriches, that if they will look at the track record of their sincere and well-motivated human rights initiatives in the 1970's they will see that they left across this planet a series of disasters of unparalleled threat in each area, that their interventions, while well meaning, were as fundamentally flawed as a 13-year-old deciding that he could be an appendectomy surgeon and cutting open his sister's tummy to see whether or not he could take out her appendix.

The thing that bothered me, and I say this as somebody who 2 years ago voted for the liberal bill on sanctions on South Africa because I wanted at that time to express my condemnation and my disagreement with South Africa on apartheid, that having studied much more carefully, having over the last 2 years had a lot more time to think about this question of how a democracy functions in a dangerous world, I think there are certain fundamental flaws in the liberal approach

to sanctions and there are certain fundamental flaws in the liberal approach to how you help a nation make the transition to democracy. And if our liberal friends will look at Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, if they will look at Iran, if they will look at the problems in Nicaragua today, and on the other hand, if they will look at some success stories: Why is it that Argentina is today a democracy? Why is it that El Salvador is, and I am going to quote in my special order from the New York Times which says today, "As Duarte begins a visit to the United States, optimism returns to El Salvador."

What are the lessons of success in creating a positive environment? I think we will see a very different story in looking at that special order.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. I think that one of the key points that needs to be raised in all of this is what do the reformers in some of these countries wish to have done.

Over the last several months I have had an opportunity because of my involvement with the South African issue to talk to people from South Africa, not the people who are trying to defend the status quo there, not the people who are trying to move slowly in ending apartheid, but the people who are taking the risks within their own country to try to end that absolutely horrible system, and they have seen, in some cases, opposition Members of Parliament, in some cases tribal leaders. But they are people who are very much involved in their own country in trying to stop the apartheid system, in trying to empower black South Africans in a way that they will have opportunities to be a part of the economic and political processes of their nation in the future.

□ 1240

What we hear from them almost uniformly is that they do not agree with an approach that will decimate the economy in their country, that they think that that would be counterproductive to everything that they are attempting to achieve; that they believe that what we need to do is have the kind of activity in South Africa that assures that American businesses and the American presence there is such that it empowers blacks economically, that it gives them the opportunities necessary to become a part of the political process, that it shows by example that in fact a nonsegregated society is the strong route for South Africa to pursue in the future.

If we can develop those kinds of policies in this country then we will have the opportunity to see South Africa not be lost as a pro-Western country but, rather, become a country that recognizes the need to have its black majority involved in all aspects of its society, but does so in a way that does not

force it to go the route of a dictatorship of a Zimbabwe or other kinds of nations in Africa that have proven to be economic and political disasters.

I have been struck with what I have heard from a lot of these leaders that we would face a very grave decision if we move in the direction that some are suggesting where we pull out and simply say that South Africa is so bad that we should have no involvement there.

There is no doubt that it is bad, there is no doubt there is a major problem there, there is no doubt something needs to be done. Some of us in this country have taken a stand against people in our own political ranks who basically were willing to support the status quo.

Our own administration is not happy with some of us who have seemed to say we want to go further than the administration's constructive-engagement policies because we think something more needs to be done.

But to go the route of attempting to undermine and destroy the economy of South Africa in the hopes of reforming it is probably not only counterproductive but actually destructive of the future relationships of this country with theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, who has been very, very active in this field and will probably offer on the floor next week one of the major alternatives to be debated as part of our discussion of the entire apartheid act.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding.

I think really, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman and our colleague from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, have absolutely focused on the real question we ask next weekend, perhaps a question that will have significance on down the road in terms of other foreign policy actions.

That question is do we simply want to make a moral statement that makes us feel good, a legitimate moral statement that may be correct, et cetera, or do we want to be constructive and positive in influencing change elsewhere around the world?

I think South Africa hits that example better than anything else.

There is to my knowledge no one who is a Member of this body who does not absolutely deplore what is going on in South Africa at the present time; say it is wrong, say that it needs to be changed, and it needs to be changed as soon as possible.

The question is how do you bring about that change? Or don't we want to be a part of the process of bringing about change, do we simply want to make moral statements?

As you look at some of the options we will consider next week there are

really two very separate and distinct alternatives. One alternative is going to come up and immediately impose sanctions on the Government of South Africa, upon American companies doing business in South Africa, et cetera, saying "Today is decision day, period. There is no future, there is no opportunity for change, come what may in South Africa we are going to make that decision." That sounds good. It makes good press releases. It makes you feel good.

I would suggest to anyone who studies what is going on with South Africa and realizes that until you make those changes you need to deal with the Government that is there whether you like it or not and how do you bring about political change in that system under the present process?

Now we can come down with all kinds of heavy-handed statements as some administrations in this Government have done during history with South Africa and elsewhere around the world and we could have that government rejected. We can have them put their backs up against the wall and affirm their position and say: "I am not going to allow the United States, the big brother from the West, to tell us what to do."

I think there are some indications in the past that that has happened even in South Africa.

The question is, "How do we come down with a moral statement then which allows them to make positive decisions and really bring about some change?"

Really I think there are going to be two substitutes offered next week which merit some type of consideration in this regard. I shall be offering one. Our colleague from Michigan, Mr. SILJANDER, intends to be offering another. They are not all that different. Really we are talking about much the same thing from two different perspectives. Perspective No. 1 would be that we provide additional funding, funding in particular aimed at the blacks in South Africa. They need education. It is a crime when you compare the amount of public funds invested in education for the black population in South Africa with that invested by the Government in the education of their whites, and we need to provide some additional funds, some additional scholarships, some additional training programs to allow them to move forward and to become a part of the future, viable South African economy.

The other side is what we call conditional investment. That is, do you allow no investment with immediate sanctions, which the major proposal in front of us next week will do? Or do we do nothing? Or is there a middle ground? I suggest there is a middle ground in which we allow the concept of some type of conditional invest-

ment, we allow investment to occur for a couple of years, we lay down the conditions to pass laws with respect to the homelands, those types of things which absolutely must be changed, and we then come back and we say, 1 to 2 years down the road, what has happened, what progress has been made, has progress been made, is South Africa changing their ways and moving into the modern world of recognizing each person for their true equality and legitimacy of purpose on this Earth?

Now many people would say well, you ought not to even have conditional investment, you ought to just allow investment because investment is a step in the right direction.

I think it is wrong for America to totally ignore the issue. We are the leader of the free world. That leadership gives us some responsibility. And by virtue of that we do have an obligation to make sure that some type of positive action does occur in South Africa at some point in time. But we do not come in as heavy-handed big brother and say, "Do it now or you are done." Rather what we do is we come forth and say, "Here are our conditions. You decide."

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would allow me to reclaim my time, I think the points the gentleman makes are good ones. He also mentioned a third alternative which I think we need to recognize. There are a number of policy-oriented people in this country, a lot of people in the public who believe we should do nothing with regard to South Africa, the status quo is just fine and ultimately they will work things out for themselves. My own impression of that is that that is not really a responsible policy option if in fact you are truly anti-apartheid at this point.

I am afraid, and my reaction is that we have some people in this country, I am sad to say, who are actually pro-apartheid, who are perfectly satisfied to see this system continue.

I think that is sad but the fact is you also have people who claim to be anti-apartheid but do not want to do anything.

The problem with that is if you talk to the people within the country who want to see reforms made, they say that is not an option. If the United States, in order to assure that there is movement to end the apartheid system, which they think there is a historic opportunity to do right now, needs to confront the Government of South Africa with some kind of a program.

Now they would argue that it should not be a disinvestment program of the type some of our liberal friends are talking about offering, that that is the wrong route; but that we need to do something, we need to have some kind of a program.

Many of them endorse, for instance, mandatory Sullivan principles, mandatory labor practices for American businesses. They endorse ideas like helping in educating black leaders and the black populace. They are for positive kinds of alternatives of that type, but they think that would put the appropriate kind of pressure on their Government and would do so in a way that is positive, a positive thrust for the future. But they are adamantly opposed to doing something, as the gentleman mentioned a few minutes ago, to make ourselves feel good.

The problem is part of this debate is not a debate about South Africa but it is a debate how we are going to be perceived in this country.

□ 1250

Now, the question that the gentleman raises is a true one: Is that really the important question here, how this plays out in this country, or do we want to do some positive good? Is this posturing or is it real?

I think that if we can develop an approach like the gentleman has suggested, which also is the approach which seems to be gaining the most credibility in the Senate, we actually have a chance of enacting something here, something that would send all the right messages to the South African Government that they have got to begin to change, and it has got to be a change of a very rapid nature.

If we end up doing nothing but posturing for political purposes or whatever purposes; moral purposes, social purposes, economic purposes—I do not know why we are posturing, but if that is all we end up doing with what we do on this floor, and we end up with a bill that the President will not sign that gets vetoed, that has very little chance of getting a two-thirds override vote in either House, we end up then, having had the major discussion in the country where nothing is done.

What kind of signal does that send to South Africa? It says that the political process here is not able to respond, that they are more interested in posturing for political purposes back home than they are in really responding, and it seems to me that you end up then with the South African Government getting precisely the wrong signal, and perhaps we aggravate the very situation that we claim to want to solve.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Exactly. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I think it perhaps even more serious than that. The gentleman indicated earlier that we are facing this question of perception. The issue is now going to be before us, and all of a sudden, now the question is what are we going to do? To fall to pass something by the House and by

the Senate at this point would probably be interpreted around the world, at least by many in South Africa, as an indication of American support for the present policies of South Africa.

So I think that we are beyond the hill, so to speak, and going down the other side, and the question now is how do we handle that, and so we do have a very important responsibility to find a policy. We can pass here, it can pass the other body, that the administration can support, and live with, and can bring about some positive reform in South Africa.

Mr. WALKER. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows as I do, that the administration is going to be reluctant to sign onto nearly anything, and we are going to have to fight and persuade in order to get the administration to sign onto anything which appears to be a modification of their constructive engagement policy.

So that we ought to come up with something that at least some of us who have some credibility with the administration can go to the White House and suggest to them that this is something that should be signed. If we come up with something that we do not think has credibility, we are going to have a very difficult time convincing the administration that it is a good idea; as a matter of fact, I do not intend to be a part of a process of asking the administration to sign onto something that I think would be destructive.

So that the point here is whether or not we are able to get by our own political divisions in this country and our own political rhetoric in this country and really accomplish something that will do some good in South Africa.

I think that that is the key question before us. It has been the key question, it seems to me, since the start of this debate. That is the reason why some of us wrote a letter to the South African Ambassador back in December, to try to join into the debate, because we thought it was important that South Africa begin to realize that there was no place in this country, there was no body of political opinion large enough to be called real opinion that supported what they were doing in the apartheid system.

Now there was a need to look toward policy options that would make that extremely clear to South Africa. Now we have come down to this point where we are going to have to define those policy options in a meaningful way, and the gentleman, I know his work with some of the people in the other body who are developing an approach here, and I have worked on some legislative approaches, but they are all headed in the same direction; and that is to do the right thing that will allow the kind of investment activities in South Africa that produces

real change and not just ends up producing rhetoric that has the appearance of wanting to change.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman brings up another very, very important point. I want to commend you for your leadership; you really were one of the first people on our side of the aisle who took this issue and said that this is not a Democrat or a Republican issue; it is a moral, it is an American, it was a freedom issue, and the gentleman needs to be commended for that.

THE 92 GROUP'S FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PURSELL. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for an additional 5 minutes, and we will go from there.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman, and I was simply going to make the point that there really is a need, I think, to focus on the debate next week, and to assure the American people that we are not engaged in a process which is aimed at producing another foreign policy disaster, but that we have recognized mistakes that have been made in the past with a number of allies around the world, and that we are now going to attempt to make the right kind of changes in policy; that kinds of changes that produce modifications in systems that we find abhorrent; that produces an opportunity for the majority blacks in South Africa to be a vital part of all that goes on in their country, but that we do so in a way that does not turn the country into some kind of a pro-Soviet despotism which has been too often the example of what has happened.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take some time this afternoon to officially introduce, to the House of Representatives of the United States a Federal budget presented on behalf of Group 92; about 40 Republicans who have worked on this document since January, so that we could meet the deadline of the Budget Act which was yesterday, May 15.

This budget document that I have introduced on behalf of our group, is a reflection of Representatives from many different States of this country, to outline what we think is the number one goal of this Nation; to some day achieve a balanced budget.

It is not easy to write a Federal budget. Many Members have commitments in their congressional districts; responsibilities in their standing com-

mittees, here in Washington, so we have gone above the call of duty, you might say, and tried to spend some extra hours, to outline this budget for this Nation.

So today, in introducing this concurrent resolution, I want to take a few minutes to indicate to our people in this Nation that many Members of Congress who volunteered, on our side of the aisle, to participate in this task force have given of their time personally over and above the call of duty to contribute intelligent, substantive suggestions and policy decisions on what makes up a Federal budget.

We know that a budget is not an attractive issue that appeals to general audiences; but a budget is what I consider the most sacred document of this Nation aside from the Constitution. It outlines where this Nation is going philosophically.

Is it fiscally responsible? Is it compassionate? Are we conscientious about how we spend other people's money? I think Group 92 has outlined this.

□ 1300

We are proud and we think we have a magnificent document.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I apologize for disrupting the gentleman's remarks, but I do want to take a moment to commend him for his leadership on this thing. The gentleman from Michigan, more than anyone, is responsible for the group of us who were able to sit down and set aside all our parochial, regional, and philosophical differences and come together with a budget that achieves over a \$50 billion deficit reduction in a fair and equitable manner. I am absolutely convinced that the budget the gentleman is presenting is the fairest, it is the most balanced budget being considered by this Congress in either body. It is the most accurate, all its numbers have been checked by the Congressional Budget Office. There is no smoke, there are no mirrors, it is all hard, difficult decisions. I just hope that everyone in this body recognizes the gentleman's leadership and compliments him for the major contribution he has made not only to our process here but to the economic future of this country.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his remarks. The gentleman from Wisconsin has been a member of the task-force and has made significant contributions to this task-force effort.

I want to take a few minutes to list the Members who contributed their time and effort, to this task-force project. I will read them so that we will include all of the Members who were active:

The Honorable HAMILTON FISH, JR., from New York, one of the senior members of the Committee on Science and Technology; the Honorable STEWART MCKINNEY, from Connecticut, who has contributed many long hours; the Honorable MATTHEW RINALDO from New Jersey, one of the more senior Members of Congress; myself, from Michigan; the Honorable DOUG BEREUTER from Nebraska, who has made major contributions; the Honorable STEVE GUNDERSON from Wisconsin, from whom we just heard; the Honorable CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER from Rhode Island, who has been a budget analyst and has been involved in environmental issues and other issues since her tenure here in the House; the Honorable ROD CHANDLER from the State of Washington, has made a major contribution in the area of defense and the need for reform.

We also have the Honorable NANCY JOHNSON from Connecticut, who has made some enormous contributions in respect to the more compassionate programs, the sensitive social programs that impact not only on her State but the country; the Honorable JOHN MCKERNAN from Maine, who made some significant suggestions; the Honorable THOMAS RIDGE from Pennsylvania, who has made a good contribution to the effort of our task-force report and our final budget document; the Honorable ED ZSCHAU from California, who has expertise and has worked in small business and entrepreneurial activities and has made a contribution toward our effort; the Honorable PAUL HENRY from Grand Rapids, MI, from former President Gerald Ford's district, who is a former member of the State Board of Education in Michigan and a former member of the State senate, with whom I served over the years, and he is an outstanding bright young man who has a great future in this House.

Also, the Honorable JOHN ROWLAND from Connecticut, who has made some major proposals and has been an active participant in our deliberations.

Saying all that and completing our task force names, I have to say that Congressman TOM TAUKE and Congresswoman OLYMPIA SNOWE have provided some outstanding leadership in offering some policy judgments, strategic judgments, and political judgments each day to the Members.

It is difficult for one person to grasp the complexity of the budget process.

What does this budget really do? Why is it important? Why do we spend time on writing a Federal budget? Why are we not working on other issues?

Well, public policy says that you have so many hours in a day, so many hours in a week, and so you make judgments as an elected official to concentrate on the important issues of

the day that face this Nation. And, obviously, I believe that developing a constructive budget is of the highest order in public policy.

In the last 37 years we have only had six balanced budgets, and very close balanced budgets, I might add, very few dollars were left over, out of those 6 years our deficit is at an all-time high. We could take time to analyze why that occurs. We will not do that today because we all recognize that the deficit is jeopardizing the future stability of real economic growth for this Nation.

I see that interest rates dropped slightly yesterday. Inflation is down, thanks to the administration and Congress efforts. The real facts of life as of today are that we have approximately \$210 billion to \$220 billion deficit. This is a major deficit facing a young country only 200 years old.

So it is incumbent upon us to say: How do we address that? How do we eliminate the deficit?

A family cannot afford to have a deficit over a long period of time. Neither can a small business or a large corporation. And when you look at a budget, you say: Where can I make reductions? Where can I tighten the belt and close down those exorbitant expenditures and reevaluate national priorities in such a way that we can protect the important responsibilities, the constitutional responsibilities under our Constitution, and at the same time achieve a balanced budget so that we can feel comfortable with that policy decision.

Frankly, I am one of the more traditional Members of the Republican Party. I believe very strongly in supply-side economics in respect that we need to lower our tax rates. We have done that recently. I have been an advocate and supporter of that. Some said we need to do it in a 3-year proposal, reducing our tax structure over 3 years. I thought maybe it might be more appropriate to reduce our tax rates over 5 years, a little longer spread but a little less impact on that staggering deficit. So we had the revenues to continue a balanced budget. But in spite of that, the Kemp-Roth proposal was sound, and I think the majority of the Members of Congress feel that it has made a major contribution to the economic recovery of this Nation.

□ 1310

That is the revenue side. A budget has revenue on one side and expenditures on the other. Congress, over the years, has said simply that the easy way out is to tax and then spend. Next year comes along and we look at new revenues and we tax again. And the State legislatures look at tax increases. My State, under the present Governor, James Blanchard, a Democrat, included a new 2-percent income tax for

the State of Michigan when he was elected.

I believe that when you look at Federal taxation and State taxation and local governments who have taxing powers, and revenue-producing ordinances and powers, and then you look at the local cities and townships who have taxing powers, you see the accumulation of taxes on top of taxes, and you drive a nation into what I call an early bankruptcy as you look at the history of nations throughout the world.

So it is time to pause and time to reevaluate where this Nation has been in respect to the taxing side and the revenue side, and it is very obvious, very obvious to me, that we needed to concentrate this year on the expenditure side; looking at the rate of expenses.

Let's look at a good, classic example, Medicare; an important program. It is part of our health program, but Medicare and Medicaid now cost over \$100 billion, and is growing at such a rapid rate that it could jeopardize the program itself. Medicare is growing at the rate of 15 percent per year, and that rate of spending could jeopardize the Medicare Program itself.

So it is nice to have great programs, but it is more important to have fiscally sound programs, and so this Congress will have to look at those entitlement programs like Medicare. I illustrate just those two examples of programs that need attention on behalf of the Members of Congress and the Nation.

We have authorization bills that are now going through the House. We have had four. The NASA bill; the Bureau of Standards bill; the State Department bill, I believe; and one other in which this authorization bills were coming at the 1986 target, higher than 1985. So the trend was continuing in Congress until we came to grips with these four authorization bills on the floor and said, look, let us stop; let us reflect. If we are going to address the deficit, if we are going to have a good budget this year, we must start looking at a freeze. The current legislation should demand that we not spend one dime more on these authorization and appropriation bills than we spent last year. In other words, put a freeze on and hold those lines of appropriations and authorization to the 1985 levels.

Well, what will a freeze get you in a budget document, in a budget? A freeze in the Federal Government basically will add up to about \$32 billion. You must look for additional money to achieve the \$50 billion which the President, the Senate, and I think most Members of the House would agree is somewhat realistic. It is a target, looking at \$50 billion to take out of a trillion-dollar budget. Maybe it is not much, but it is changing the trend. It is changing the direction. It is

changing fundamental policy that you have seen in this House, which has been tax and then spend; tax and then spend.

So these freeze efforts have been applied, and we have offered amendments in the House to turn that around. Our group and others, Congressman MORRISON and others, in a bipartisan effort this year, are trying to get a budget, hold-the-line policy so that we reduce the rate of growth and reduce the rate of spending at least to the 1985 level.

Our budget proposal, similar to the Senate, will accomplish the first goal this year, in 1986, starting in October, of achieving a \$51 billion target to reduce deficit. There are hard numbers within our budget proposal.

Followed by that the next year, 1987, we will achieve a \$91.2 billion deficit reduction target, and then the third year, a \$132 billion target to reduce the deficit. So if you look at charts and you look at graphs, what I am saying here is that we are changing the trend from the rate of spending upwards and turning that graph down so that we are moving toward a lower deficit and eventually, toward a balanced budget.

Obviously, there are many ways to do it. Republicans in the Senate have accomplished a comprehensive budget proposal. The Democrats are marking up now, today and through the weekend, and will have a proposal ready for us I think next week. The Group 92 plan is one we call a Blueprint For Balance. Basically, the major points are as follows:

A \$51 billion deficit reduction for 1986 without a tax increase. I repeat, without a tax increase. No. 2, a comprehensive freeze, including defense, in 1986 budget authority of \$32 billion. I indicated it will get you about \$32 billion in a freeze movement.

No. 3, additional deficit reductions beyond the freeze of over 75 programs that we have looked at in the Federal budget in the Federal Government. We have picked up an additional \$19 billion over the \$32 billion. You add those two together and you get your \$51 billion budget numbers.

The 1986 budget that we are proposing, which achieves a \$51 billion deficit reduction package includes the following: \$24.6 billion in defense programs, which is about 48 percent of our savings. \$24 billion in nondefense programs, which is about 47 percent of our budget savings. Then because those two are generally even and fair-handed, in looking at our budget, we achieve a little extra benefit because we have accomplished that \$51 billion mark by saving the interest on the national debt out of the general fund of about \$2.4 billion.

Do I think that is important? I think it is incredibly important when all of

us in the Nation should understand that the national debt is now \$1,800 billion. It sort of shakes me up a little bit to even say what those numbers are when you look at the zeros and try to outline what a national debt is. A national debt means we are spending more than our income; we are borrowing almost 20 percent of our revenue in this general budget this year. Borrowing money to pay our bills.

What are we doing to our young generation? What are we doing to the Nation when we borrow more and we have more expenditures than we have income? Certainly we are on a self-destructive path in my opinion. I think when you look at a national debt of \$1,800 billion, if you can visualize those numbers for a moment, we will be taking out of the General Fund this year an amount to pay the interest on that national debt.

What does that mean? Translated, it means to every taxpayer that every dollar that comes to Washington from the American taxpayer, 15 cents off the top goes right to pay the interest on the national debt. Fifteen cents of every dollar. That is something that all young Americans should be concerned with as well as every taxpayer, because this is accumulating and it is now, the interest on the national debt in the General Fund, is the second most expensive program in the Federal Government, next to the Social Security Program.

□ 1320

I indicated we are making a recommendation with respect to Social Security, and individuals in our group have different opinions on whether we should preserve the COLA's for Federal employees and military and Social Security recipients, and we feel probably, in light of what the Senate has done and what the House may do in keeping the COLA's in for Social Security recipients in the House that there probably ought to be, in my opinion, some bipartisan agreement in respect to the Social Security issue.

I was just looking at a poll here over the weekend published in the New York Times in which the question was asked in reference to the military dollar, and I would like to talk about the military for a minute. The public was asked: Do you think Federal spending on military and defense programs should be increased, decreased, or kept about the same?

In 1981, 61 percent said it should be increased. In 1983, 32 percent said it should be increased. In 1984, 22 percent said it should be increased, and in 1985, 19 percent said it should be increased, and in February of this year, only 16 percent said it should be increased.

Polls mean different things to different people, and polls are phrased in different language to get different re-

sults, but I think the trend is all I am interested in today. The defense budget has increased now to 28 percent of the general fund. Dollarwise translated, it is about \$1 trillion 2 billion new dollars since President Carter left office.

As a former military officer in the Army, it was obvious to me that many of our military programs were inadequate and our national security was at question. If you have traveled the world as I have, it is obvious that the efforts in national security were certainly questionable because we were not in what I call a high standard of national security in terms of readiness, irrespective of the weapons systems.

This Nation was not prepared to preserve the freedom of this Nation, which is our fundamental constitutional responsibility. The States do not have this responsibility. In education we have decentralized education to local school boards and State governments, so the billions spent for education is now the responsibility of local school boards and elected State legislatures. Fundamentally it is their responsibility, and our responsibility primarily is national defense.

The defense budget needs to be reviewed in depth to establish some credibility in financing and management. The Secretary, I think, is very cognizant of that in recent months, and I think that Congress is asking for that hard, in-depth look at change that is necessary to look at our national security and look at our mission. Can we be all things to all people? We have troops in almost every country in the free world. Is that good national security? In a lot of cases it is. It is good foreign policy, obviously. The strategic deployment of troops is important and critical to this Nation. How is their readiness? Is their morale factor high?

So there have been some very positive initiatives brought forth by this administration and by Congress to rebuild and to restructure and to look at procurement policies and to strengthen this Nation on behalf of not only the United States, but fundamentally a much greater effort at being the leader of the free world.

This is the first budget document introduced in the House of Representatives this year to comply with the Budget Act. As a matter of fact, as of this hour it is the only one. The Democrats are working on theirs and probably will have theirs introduced next week. We wanted to comply with the Budget Act because it should be timely.

□ 1330

One of the basic process problems of this Nation is that we have not been presenting budgets on time. Our authorization and appropriation bills have been late, and so near the end of

June and July and August we do not have our work completed on time, which I think is inappropriate, and we finish up by putting together one document called a C.R., a continuing resolution, in which we package everything that is left undone and pass it and get it over to the President.

Well, if I were the Chief Executive of this Nation, I would send it back and say, "This is inappropriately completed under the Budget Act," and I would personally veto it simply because it is bad budget process and it is bad management.

Our obligation is to have a budget completed and our authorizations and appropriations signed into law by October 1, so that by the fiscal year's ending, the President has before him 13 appropriation bills.

Now, that is just good business practice, and it is time that this Nation pressure and encourage and write to the Members of Congress, all of us, to say, "Please, Mr. Congressman," or "Mr. Senator, get your budget completed on time and get those bills to the President by October 1."

Then we could say that we have a fiscally sound document that we can stand tall and be proud of, and we could say that this Nation has a balanced budget that is completed on time.

That is good business policy.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida, who is serving on the Budget Committee. And let me say that I appreciate his leadership.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We just had a break from the Budget Committee, as the gentleman probably knows. We are involved in the markup session now on the budget, and I just wanted to take a moment here to not only compliment you for the work you have done but the entire 92 Group.

Having worked with the budget and the numbers and knowing that it is not simply a question of mathematically adding up or subtracting out numbers or dollars, I know those are very difficult decisions one has to make in going through that process, all the way from international affairs to national defense to the COLA's and everything else.

I just want to compliment the 92 Group not only for the effort they put into it but also for the product. I believe the gentleman mentioned earlier that it is the only budget proposal that is out at this time that complies with the Budget Act.

Mr. PURSELL. And on time.

Mr. MACK. That is interesting. If I may build on that for just a moment, we are now involved in the markup of

a budget document in the Budget Committee that has not been priced out by the Congressional Budget Office.

The point I am making is that while you have done your work, we are now finding ourselves, in the Budget Committee, the day after our resolution should have been completed, not in the Budget Committee itself but on the floor of the House should have been passed. We are not even working with the document that has been gone through by the Congressional Budget Office.

I would imagine that in your experience, after having done what you have, that is, after having your work reviewed by the Congressional Budget Office, you found that there were may modifications that came up as a result of it. Therefore, I know you have found it is a very worthwhile process to go through, and it has elevated your work to the point of a great deal of credibility. For that I commend you, and I appreciate the work you have done and the impact you have had on the system.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, who is an active leader in the budget process and who understands fiscal management and general good government policy.

We are proud of our document. We know there are differences of opinion on some of the numbers. We are not as far away from the Senate on defense and some others as one might think, and overall we are proud to have this document introduced here on time to meet the Budget Act and be what I call responsible Members of the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

I want to commend the gentleman personally and in fact all the Republican Members who gathered together under his leadership on this topic, and I am looking forward to other similar initiatives on other very important topics because I think the 92 Group is a continuing evolution of a very important development of new ideas and new approaches in a creative effort to sincerely develop the best possible good-government approach to solving some problems that can get mired down in ideology and partisanship.

So at least for this particular Member, I want to say to you and other Members who I know worked many hours with you—because I talked to some of them who went through some very long sessions with you—that I appreciate and I think every Republican and, I hope, every Member of this Congress will appreciate the kind of integrity and intel-

tual commitment you and the task force put into developing this budget. And I hope they will treat it with the kind of seriousness that it deserves as a major step toward trying to think through the kind of fiscal dilemmas we are in.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I might indicate in summary, looking at some of the details of the budget, that there had been some discussion where our defense numbers might be a little different than the Senate's and the President's numbers.

Our group came in a little tougher than the Senate. We said, "Let's have more fiscal control, and let's go with a freeze in defense until we see where we are in the defense budget." But we are only \$9 billion lower on defense in budget authority than the Senate, but in budget outlay we are only \$3.2 billion away from the Senate figure. So we are not far from the Senate numbers. And as I understand it, as I have seen the Democratic proposal, they indicated they are coming in pretty close to our numbers, since with our numbers, not only in defense but in the other budget functional categories, about 22 functions, the proposals that they may be offering will be close to the Senate's and ours in terms of the overall goal.

Frankly, I do not know how the Democrats get \$56 billion in their budget. Their soft numbers in the budget have to be looked at, as the gentleman from Florida indicated. Their numbers have not been put through the Congressional Budget Office, so I think there will be some soft numbers there that need to be cleared up, and I think the truth in the debate on the budget will be forthcoming next week, as we probably have about 10 hours of full debate on this high agenda item, namely, addressing and putting together a Federal budget.

Sometimes it is not very exciting to discuss these issues, but I think it is appropriate that the 92 Group has, I hope, made a contribution to the White House, to the Senate, and to our colleagues on the Democratic side, as well as our Republican colleagues. Our 182 Republicans here, and looking for alternatives and looking for timely budget decisions. And it does feel appropriate that our budget has been introduced on time.

So I close my remarks by complimenting again my task force, the members of the steering committee, and other Members, about 40, who have joined the debate and who have learned a great deal. There are new Members who have had the exciting experience of putting together a Federal budget, who have learned what numbers are about and what fiscal responsibility is about, and who have learned how to say no to spending pro-

grams. That is tough, but that is political courage.

I think I can speak for the group that we were concerned about the direction of the Nation. It is bad public policy, it is bad economic policy, it is even bad politics to spend more than you earn from your income.

I think this Nation will be appreciative of the efforts of Members of Congress, both in the House and the Senate. Hopefully in a bipartisan effort we will have a budget completed through the congressional process so that the President of the United States will get appropriation bills on time to address the problems of this Nation in a fiscally appropriate manner.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for their efforts, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1340

FOUR GREAT CHALLENGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk today about the need for new thinking, new strategies, and new institutions in America's foreign policy.

I will discuss briefly the cocaine trade, terrorism, the Leninist-Soviet threat, particularly in Nicaragua, and the problem of dealing with governments that we are not very happy with, such as the Government of South Africa with whose position of apartheid I totally disagree and which virtually every American wants to see changed.

The real theme of this talk is the question of effectiveness and at the heart of it I want to respond first to an article recently published in the New Republic, called "Realigners Cop Out" by Anthony J. Blinken, and second, I want to deal with the challenges raised by Abba Eban, the former Prime Minister of Israel in his new book, "The New Diplomacy, International Fears in the Modern Age," because I think that the question of our proposed policies in South Africa can be understood only in a larger context of what is America's role in the world and how do we deal with the complex realities of a planet on which there is sadly a great deal of violence and which, unfortunately, we have currently no effective American doctrine for survival.

Let me take as one example of the realities we must deal with, the Washington Times for today. Its headline stories include a story that carries us back to the Korean airliner being shot down by the Soviet Union, an article on international terrorists selecting new American targets in which the Is-

lamic Jihad issues ultimatum, threatens to kill six Westerners; an article on hearings yesterday in the other body in which the administration was talking about its concern over U.S. countermeasures to terrorism and how we deal with the news media and to what degree the news media in effect makes it difficult to respond to terrorism.

At the bottom of the page it says, "Firestorm of criticism engulfs Philadelphia," in which a wide range of people are unhappy with the way the Philadelphia city government dealt with a terrorist group that was equipped with two shotguns, a rifle, substantial quantities of ammunition, and had in effect turned their house into a bunker which included a steel-sided strong point on the roof of the house.

Now, the thing that I want to draw together from all this is that you and I live in a very different world than anything our parents or grandparents were ready for. When you live in a world in this building we have had a terrorist bombing in the last couple years, where you live in a world where in order to get into this building you have to go through security devices that Thomas Jefferson would have thought inconceivable; when to fly on an airplane you automatically and routinely today walk through a metal detector and do not even think about it, it has become part of the nature of our world, then we are indeed faced with some challenges.

I think that dealing with South Africa has to be seen in the context of the totality of those challenges and our friends on the left who sincerely hate apartheid, who sincerely want to change South Africa, are I think continuing the ostrich tradition of refusing to learn from their own experience, because the very same well-meaning people who asserted first that we should undermine the Shah and turn Iran into a democracy, and second that we should undermine Samozia and turn Nicaragua into a democracy, and third, that we should not help the forces of democracy in El Salvador because they clearly were incapable of winning, those people were intellectually wrong in every case.

In a number of cases, for those who have served long enough, they also had the same tradition in the seventies of being opposed to our involvement in propping up a free government in South Vietnam and in Cambodia propping up a pro-American Government and being opposed to our being involved in Africa to try to help create a free government in Angola.

Now, the first point I want to make is that the track record of the ostrich faction of American life in being able to successfully produce a democratic society is pretty dismal. They failed to find a policy which would lead to South Vietnam to survive as a free so-

ciety. They failed to find a policy that would lead Cambodia to survive as a free society. They failed to find a policy that would make Iran a better country. They failed to find a policy that would make Nicaragua a free society. They have failed in Angola to produce a free society and in that tradition of failure I would say to my friends who are ostriches, what leads you to believe you are going to be more successful in South Africa?

Is not in fact the track record of what you did in Iran precisely that you are likely to destabilize the current government and produce a dictatorship, a dictatorship which is even more ruthless, even more bloody, even more worse and by any reasonable standard, Khomeini's Iran is worse than the Shah's Iran.

What leads you to believe you are going to be successful in South Africa in destabilizing gradually only by pulling out American influence? In fact, are you not just kidding yourselves?

Are we not in effect seeing here on the left a moral temper tantrum which will in fact probably lead to exactly the opposite policy, exactly the opposite results?

I would say to my friends who are ostriches, why would you think that forcing American companies to leave South Africa helps integration? We are the largest, most complex integrated society in the world. American companies have had more experience integrating than any other companies in the world.

What makes you think that French companies in a country which is basically all white, German companies in a country which is all white, are going to have a higher level of experience?

Why would you think that Japanese companies are going to be more systematically prointegration than American companies?

Why would you think that the Afrikaners, that is the Dutch-speaking South African whites who are going to buy those American factories are going to be in any sense upset if we leave? Are they not more likely in fact to be very happy at the sudden windfall profits of buying factories at a fire sale and are they not going to be glad to have Japanese and German and French and Australian companies move in, who have no interest in appeasing any domestic pressures for an integrated South Africa?

So the first point I want to drive at is that we have four great challenges to America in the last 20th century: the challenge of dealing with the cocaine trade, where we are failing; the challenge of dealing with terrorism, where we are failing; the challenge of dealing with the problem of Leninism in the Soviet Union and particularly in Nicaragua and Cuba where we are failing, and the problem of how do we effectively help countries move and

move decisively from dictatorship to democracy, when the dictatorship is not anti-American and is not committed to our destruction?

I want to draw a distinction between Cuba and Nicaragua which are dictatorships actively allied with the Soviet Union trying to destroy America and the kind of countries that our left wing ostrich friends love to focus on. Where do you find ostriches really focusing their moral energy? They are upset about South Korea, not North Korea. They are upset about the Philippines, not particularly about North Vietnam. They are upset about problems in El Salvador, not problems in Nicaragua.

They are upset about South Africa, not about Afghanistan.

So where is the moral pressure of the ostrich left in American life? It is systematically on those countries which happen to not be against the United States. If you want to see a left wing cause picketing against dictatorship, the odds are overwhelming that the country they will be mad about happens to be passively favorable to the survival of the United States. The odds are overwhelming that they will not be upset about a country which is already part of the Soviet empire.

□ 1350

Let us carry this a stage further. How successful have ostrich policies of capriciously getting America involved in destabilizing countries worked? How successful have the sanctions of the past been?

Let me quote from Abba Eban because I think it is important to recognize that in fact the ostriches have failed. This is Eban in his new book entitled "The New Diplomacy," where he talks about the Carter policies and suggests, and I quote from page 68 again: "The speed and vigor with which Carter supported the tide of change obscured an essential question. Was any regime in the world so oppressive that it was incapable of becoming more so? The dilemma was well illustrated in Iran and Nicaragua. When the United States weakened a pro-Western dictatorship, the end result was not a pro-Western democracy but an anti-Western despotism. The Ayatollah Khomeini was no improvement on the Shah. This tends to support the view that the United States should determine its relations with other nations in accordance with their contribution to stability rather than by reference to their domestic conduct."

Notice this is the Foreign Minister, former Foreign Minister of Israel saying flatly that when the United States gets involved in a country like Iran without having thought it through, the most likely result is a government which is more anti-Ameri-

can, more vicious in terms of oppressing its own people, and less willing to move toward freedom.

Let me in that sense carry you back for a moment to today's Washington Times in which they talk a little bit about terrorism. What was the net result of terrorism as it relates to Iran and the so-called reform of Iran? There was a 39 percent increase during 1984 in state-sponsored acts of terrorism, a rise from 70 to 94.

Under Secretary of Defense Fred C. Ikle cited Iran and Libya as responsible for all but five of the acts of terrorism. In other words, 89 of the 94 acts of terrorism in 1984, 89 of the 94 were caused by either Iran or by Libya.

They are in effect not acts of terrorism. They are a form of warfare which Iran and Libya have invented which allows them to kill us while we do nothing.

In that setting let me suggest to you that the end result of the ostrich-like policies of urging the Shah to be decent without providing the support, the mechanisms, the time to do it, led to a situation in which Iran is now governed by a country which is systematically supporting the killing of people.

As the article said in today's Washington Times:

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—The terrorist group Islamic Jihad sent a Beirut newspaper pictures of six abducted Westerners, including four Americans, and issued "for the last time" conditions for their release.

Hours earlier and apparently unrelated, eight gunmen kidnapped a senior Irish U.N. official as he was being driven to work in Beirut's Moslem sector.

Now, in that sense I think the American people need to stop and say to themselves we really live in a world in which two governments, Iran and Libya, are systematically killing Westerners and we are doing nothing about it because we have no sophisticated doctrine, no way of effectively dealing with state terrorism and in fact our allies do not even understand the problem.

France, for example, a country which is broadly allied with us, a country which is democratic, a country which is against terrorism, has rejected 120 extradition requests from Italy. And the Italians claim that France currently gives sanctuary to 117 Italian terrorists. In other words, the French Government is saying to Italian terrorists, "I don't object to you living in France as long as all your terrorism is in Italy."

Now what does that end up doing? It ends up with countries that are basically Western, that are basically democratic, because we have no official definition of terrorism as an act of war, randomly allowing people to cross the border as a tourist, set off a bomb, kill policemen, and then run back into this case France and have the French, who

are our allies, say to the Italians, who are our allies, "No, we won't help you," even though they are both in the Common Market.

The problem of state terrorism leads directly into the problem of the Soviet Union and Cuba. Mr. Ikle is quoted as saying,

The governments of the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Nicaragua have also supported terrorism, but have been conscious of the benefit of concealing their involvement so as to mislead Western opinion and to forestall a response by the democracies.

In other words, if you are dealing with ostriches, ostriches will cheerfully ignore the reality of what is happening, and the reality of what is at stake. And the ostriches will get involved in saying, "Gosh, that is not really, that is only a random terrorist," even when we can prove systematically that the terrorists are trained by Nicaraguans or Cubans or by the Soviets or when we can prove that there is a systematic process of providing arms and equipment.

We see this happening today in a success story. In El Salvador this radio report was picked up from the secret Communist radio station in Morazan Department and I want to read. This is a radio report which says as follows:

After the elections, the San Jorge mayor, who is a Christian Democratic Party member, was captured by our forces. We wanted to inform him that we would not allow the installation of municipal authorities, and, therefore, he should abstain from taking office. After warning him, we released him. A few days later, this person took office. For this reason, our forces then captured him again. As he was being led off to zones under our control, this mayor attempted to flee; that prompted an incident in which the mayor was killed.

He goes on to say, and I quote:

On May 11 our forces captured the (mayor of Checapan) in Usulután Department, and we destroyed the municipal building of (San Jose La Fuente) in La Unión Department, thus raising to over 35 the number of municipal buildings we have destroyed in the country's eastern sector.

In other words, what the radio report of the Communist guerrilla radio station in El Salvador said was that they have now adopted a policy of systematically destroying city halls and kidnapping and killing local mayors.

Why have they done that? They have done that because El Salvador is the one place in the modern world in the last 10 years where we can prove systematically that the American involvement in that country has worked by providing foreign aid directly to the Government of El Salvador, by providing military aid to the Government of El Salvador, by helping train the El Salvadoran police, and we are in fact beginning to improve El Salvador as a democratic country; we are providing it with both bread and guns so that the country is now able to move into a democratic system. And the result is

that in El Salvador the Communist guerrillas who 8 months or a year ago were able to move as a military force are being reduced back to terrorism. They are now only able to kill local government officials. They are no longer able to seize a town and hold it.

El Salvador in fact is a great success story, such a great success story that the New York Times, not an institution which normally focuses on American successes, has today a page one story entitled "As Duarte Begins a Visit to the U.S., Optimism Returns to El Salvador."

The article goes on by James LeMoyné, and I quote:

For the first time in five years of conflict, many Salvadorans and foreigners here are beginning to voice a cautious assessment that El Salvador may have halted its slide into a worsening civil war and that a degree of recovery is now possible. Whether the speaker is a Government official, a Western diplomat, a businessman, an academic or a refugee worker, the judgment that things may be getting better rather than worse is always framed with strong caveats and a recognition that recovery will be long and difficult. But given El Salvador's recent history, the appearance of even guarded optimism is a new development.

That is from the New York Times. What is it saying? It is saying that when the United States, and this happened to be a Reagan administration policy, bitterly opposed by leftwing ostriches, all of whom said it failed, we can find quote after quote after quote where leftwing ostriches in this body got up and said, "you can't save El Salvador, you can't establish democracy, you can't reform the army, you will never get the job done."

And the Reagan administration and the realists said, "If we are slow and steady and calm, if we provide military aid to defeat communist guerrillas, if we provide police training and aid to defeat the terrorists, if we provide economic aid to rebuild a war-torn country, we can save El Salvador for freedom, and, by the way, in addition, if we put pressure on Nicaragua, which is the source of the weapons, and the source of the command and the control for the guerrillas."

□ 1400

The thing is, the Reagan administration turned out to be right. The Reagan administration is winning a great victory for freedom in El Salvador.

It is in many ways like Truman's commitment to Greece and Turkey in 1947. We are saving a country from the Soviet empire. But let us carry it a stage further; let us look in more detail for a moment at El Salvador, because the motto relates directly to South Africa.

Georgie Anne Geyer, in today's Washington Times, in a column entitled "Duarte's Political Miracle." And I quote:

El Salvador is working. Christian Democrat President Jose Napoleon Duarte has taken hold of the situation. The military is seriously reforming itself and the Marxist guerrilla left in desperation has returned to a prolonged war strategy. As impossible as that might have seemed even 6 months ago, that is the situation today. Everyone now, including the army, agrees that the key is the canny president who won a majority in the latest elections this March. Mr. Duarte's peculiar brand of gradual but persistent change has turned things around. He has effectively separated the military from the death squads of the right, regained a great deal of international respect for his Christian Democrat reformist government and replaced the Marxism of the guerrillas with his party's reformist Christian ideology. In short, he has effectively satisfied the political needs and yearnings for dignity of the long suffering Salvadoran people.

Now the next paragraph is really important. It relates directly to what we have to do in South Africa and relates to what I would say is the realistic approach to reforming the world as opposed to the ostrich approach and having temper tantrums which make America feel good but leaves the rest of the world worse off.

Moving step by step but with the dogged determination that characterizes him, he at times has quietly pushed through what seemed to be but turned out not to be cautious reforms. For instance, Mr. Duarte changed the arrest procedures so that all armed men must be in uniform, must identify their arrest to the Red Cross and to the families involved. Amazingly, this has had rapid effect, particularly in cutting back the sadistic death squads of the wealthy old right. In 1980, for instance, political violence from all sources, right and left, amounted to 550 deaths a month. In the last 6 months of 1984 deaths averaged 44 a month, while in the first 2½ months of 1985 there were 85 deaths in all. Of those, 61 were attributable to the left, 16 were mysteries, and the rest of the right. These figures from the American Embassy were corroborated closely by the Catholic Church's figures.

Now, notice what we are suggesting here. According to Georgie Anne Geyer's figures, so far in 1985, 61 people were killed by the left in El Salvador, only 8 were killed by the right. So the left is now responsible for approximately 8 times as many deaths as the right. Where are the ostriches of the left in America who 2 years ago, 3 years ago were screaming loudly about right wing death squads? Where is the praise for President Reagan and President Duarte who have successfully begun to win the fight for democracy? Where is the anger directed at the left in El Salvador which is now killing people viciously because it can no longer stay in the field as a military movement?

The ostriches now turn away and say, let's not talk about El Salvador, let's talk about South Africa, because the left which can no longer explain El Salvador where after all democracy is working, the left in America which can no longer look at death by the left in El Salvador, now has found a new

ground for its experiment, a new place for its temper tantrums, it now wants to focus on South Africa, and the very people who were wrong 3 years ago about their prescription for El Salvador and therefore do not want to come and talk about it, are wrong now about their prescription for South Africa. Not that apartheid is good, apartheid is horrible. Not that we should be passive, we should be active. We should look at the kinds of activities that are working in El Salvador. Georgie Anne Geyer goes on to focus on the left:

These changes have led directly to the new tactics of the Marxist guerrilla left. The guerrillas of the Faribundo Marti liberation front now have turned from direct unit confrontations to sabotage, urban assassination and destructive of elected mayors and city halls. They have been responsible in the last month for burning 32 city halls and kidnapping 10 mayors, one of whom is known to have been killed. This is of course a way to try to sabotage the restructuring of the country by the Christian Democrats, but it appears to be a desperate move. The sabotage of the guerrillas are multiplying. Father Roberto Amilear Toruella, Director of Communications for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese here told me "it would seem to be because they are losing power. Before, they were on the offensive with spectacular hits. Now, they are not doing that, and the army is on the offensive. The extreme right has also lost prestige."

Now what is happening here? Because the United States was willing to be involved, we did not withdraw from El Salvador, we did not embargo El Salvador, we did not try to punish El Salvador into reform, we systematically offered money and training and support and counsel and guidance, and we now have in El Salvador a country which is dramatically freer, dramatically safer, in which the Communist guerrillas of the left are reduced to vicious terrorist sabotage and killings because they can no longer stay in the field.

One example, which is peculiarly ironic, and I quote this because I think it is something that every American should focus on as an example of how leftwing ostriches cripple the United States, Geyer says, speaking of Duarte:

The next dramatic thing that Mr. Duarte will do when he is in the United States this spring to give the commencement address at the University of Notre Dame, is to announce a highest level task force of investigators trained in the most sophisticated manner by the FBI in Puerto Rico. They are going to take the death squads head on.

Now, the reason that that is fascinating is that in the 1970's, in reaction to the leftwing interpretation of Vietnam, which was that it was all America's fault and that America was a vicious country, the left in this Congress made it illegal for the United States to train other police forces. The theory was that we would train them in the Gestapo tactics that would make them behave in fact the way the Soviets do behave.

Now, as all of you know, there is an enormous pressure in America to try to develop a positive approach to police work. We are adamant in trying to find ways to end police brutality, we try to have all sorts of legal protections for the person who is accused; we go to elaborate lengths to tell people of their rights, to make sure they have lawyers. What struck this gentleman, and I think it tells you a lot about the underlying pathology of ostrichism: If you seriously wanted to improve the quality of police work in the Third World you would want more people from the Third World trained by American policemen.

If you really wanted to have a fair and decent police force, an investigative force in Chile or South Africa or in El Salvador, you would want to have policemen who have ties with the United States, who have been to the FBI Academy, who have been trained and have friends among the FBI; you would want them to be more like us, to learn to be more like us, because if they do not learn to be more like us, how are they going to learn to be effective policemen? Are we going to learn from the Soviets? Are they going to invent it on their own? Now what is interesting, their fear in El Salvador, while we are beginning to get control of the death squads, we are beginning to establish justice, Georgie Anne Geyer specifically refers to the fact that the investigators were trained in the most sophisticated methods by the FBI in Puerto Rico; that, in fact, as I think Georgie Anne Geyer well understands, she has been one of the people who is helping us develop the concept of ostrichism because she reflects reality, she is trying to cope with the world as it really is. And she recognizes that having America involved intimately, having America actually try to move toward reform is the way in fact in which we can lead to a more democratic and a safer and a more prosperous world.

It is interesting in that sense, when you look at the closing paragraph here, and I quote: "Yet the long way that El Salvador has come in only the last year is truly extraordinary." Would it not be nice if we could look back at the ostrich left's efforts at reform in Iran and find an Iran there was more pro-American, more open, more modern, more democratic, more decent? But we cannot. Would it not be nice if we could look at the ostrich left attempt to change Nicaragua and to find a Nicaragua that was truly democratic, truly open, truly pro-American? But we cannot.

□ 1410

The reason is that the underlying model of how America behaves and how the world really is, is very differ-

ent from the way ostriches think and how ostriches look at the world.

There are four places where I think ostriches have a problem. First of all, in dealing with the drug trade, the cocaine dealers, with the understanding that that is now such a big industry and such an elaborate and complicated industry that it is going to take a major American effort at every level to break its back and to end the cocaine trade that is threatening to undermine Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, and the United States.

Second, in recognizing that terrorism is a systematic effort to wage war on Western democracies. The terrorism is a subtle form of warfare. It is not something different; you do not have war over here and terrorism over there. It is part of the same continuum. We in the Western democracies are going to have to invent the new language, the new executive branch systems, the new news media understanding, and the new legislative approaches that will allow us to deal directly and effectively with terrorists.

Third, the ostriches must come to grips with the reality of Leninism, the reality of the Soviet Union, and in particular the reality of Cuba and Nicaragua as Leninist states allied to the Soviet Union.

It is fascinating, when you look at El Salvador, at the effort to improve El Salvador, to then go back and ask, "Now where do the Communists in El Salvador get their help?" What you find is, in effect, Nicaragua is waging war against El Salvador. In effect Nicaragua is engaged right now in an act of warfare against El Salvador.

Let me quote from an official document, written by the House of Representatives, May 13, 1983, a report by the Intelligence Committee of the House, a committee dominated by Democrats, a committee in which the Democratic leadership has absolute control of the report, and this is what the report itself says on page 2:

The success of the insurgents in El Salvador has not been matched by political victories. It is not popular support that sustains the insurgents. As will be discussed later, this insurgency depends for its lifeblood; arms, ammunition, financing, logistics and command and control facilities, upon outside assistance from Nicaragua and Cuba.

This Nicaraguan-Cuban contribution to the Salvadoran insurgency is longstanding. It began shortly after the overthrow of Somoza in July 1979. It has provided by land, sea and air the great bulk of the military equipment and support received by the insurgents.

In other words, according to the official House Intelligence Committee report of May 13, 1983, adopted by the Democrats on the committee as well as the Republicans, the reason there was a bloody civil war going on with Communist guerrillas in El Salvador was because immediately after the ostrich left had destabilized the dictatorship

in Nicaragua, the new Nicaraguan Communist government had formed an alliance with the Cubans and the Soviets, so that they could then send equipment and aid and training to the guerrillas in El Salvador.

In effect, Nicaragua and Cuba were waging war on El Salvador. But by calling that war "guerrilla," we in the United States in our news media, in our Government, in the Congress, we do not think that is a war.

Let me ask you: If there was a group that came across from Canada or Mexico, and it came into let us say Texas from Mexico, and it kidnapped 10 mayors and it blew up 35 city halls, would we say "Gosh, let's take care of them only when they're in Texas," or would we say to the Mexican Government, "If you don't get rid of those guerrillas, we are going to send the Army in."

If you have any doubt what we would do, let me suggest you go back and look at 1915 and 1916 when in fact Pancho Villa invaded Texas and New Mexico and the U.S. Army under John J. Pershing went into Mexico.

Now, how far fetched is that? Well, when you realize that Nicaragua is closer to Miami than Miami is to Washington, DC. When you realize that Nicaragua says flatly and explicitly it is engaged in guerrillas war in Honduras, in Guatemala, in El Salvador; when you realize that those countries lead inevitably to Mexico, at what point do we start recognizing that warfare fought by guerrillas is still warfare?

Nicaragua is at war with all of Central America. If you doubt that, I will put more evidence in the RECORD in a moment, but the problem for the ostrich left is that they cannot confront it.

Notice again in this 1983 report adopted by the House, including the Democrats, "More ominous is that the Sandinistas have stepped up their support for insurgents in Honduras."

Again, notice the fancy language we have adopted in the West. "Sandinistas have stepped up their support for insurgents in Honduras." What does that mean in plain English? It means Communists in Nicaragua are waging war in alliance with people in Honduras against the country of Honduras. That is all it means.

If this report were to say that the Communists in Nicaragua sent 20 tanks into Honduras, we would say, "Oh, that's a war." But as long as they send 20 foot soldiers, carrying satchel charges to blow up city hall, that does not count as a war. Who is kidding who?

The Communists have invented a form of warfare we are losing, and we cannot even describe it.

Now, in that setting then, let me come to South Africa. We are in the same problem in South Africa we are

in in El Salvador; the same problem we were in in Nicaragua originally, the same problem we are in in Iran.

The Shah of Iran was a dictator, and he had secret police, and we should have tried to reform Iran, but as we tried to reform Iran we failed. We failed in a way which helped the Soviet Union, we failed in a way which led to thousands of people being killed, we failed in a way which led to Iran becoming a bitterly anti-American government which today sponsors terrorists who right this minute have four Americans held captive and who are threatening to kill them.

We failed. What lesson can we learn from that failure and apply to South Africa? We can learn first the lesson that if we are going to try to reform a country, we had better be slow and we had better be positive.

My goal is not simply to eliminate apartheid. I do not want to replace a white dictatorship with a black dictatorship, for example. I do not want to replace a pro-Western dictatorship with a pro-Communist dictatorship. I am not willing to accept the idea that any change in South Africa is automatically good.

Remember, if you will, back on page 68, what Abba Eban said. He said:

The speed and vigor with which Carter supported the tide of change obscured an essential question: Was any regime in the world so oppressive that it was incapable of becoming more so?

Now let us apply—and I think that the Carter administration was the only administration we have had in modern times which was committed, as a matter of policy, to a leftwing ostrich foreign policy, a foreign policy which failed so totally that there are no serious Democrats who would defend it today.

Let us look at that policy and apply it to our friends on the left and their version of how to deal with South Africa. What do they want to do to South Africa? They want to first of all, on the extreme form, cut off all American involvement in South Africa. The extreme leftwing ostrich position on South Africa is: Let's sell everything.

What would the result be? The result would be we would liquidate our holdings; companies, ownership in land. Who would get those holdings? Would people get those holdings who are prointegration? No. Not necessarily. Many of those holdings would be bought by white South Africans who are perfectly happy to buy up at 10 or 15 percent of value American holdings. Would they be more likely to free up their country? No.

So what else would happen? With America gone, with the daily process of talking to Americans gone, with the manager for Ford Motor Co. gone; with the manager for Mobil Oil Co.

gone, what everyday person is going to interact with South African businessmen and tell them the virtues of democracy and the virtues of immigration and the virtues of freedom? What businessmen are there going to be there who have systematically worked with black Americans and had the experience of an integrated workplace? None.

The Germans do not have that background; the British do not have that background. The Australians do not have that background; the Japanese do not have that background. So where are they going to get this experience? Where is the white South African going to be reassured that it is possible to live in an integrated society and really have things work?

Those who are for absolute extreme disinvestment are in effect for cutting off South Africa from exactly the lessons of integration which we have learned at such great cost and which we could teach.

Let us go to a second level. There are people, sincere people, who I voted for several years ago before I really got involved in studying this problem who say, "Well, let's show that we are morally superior. Let's just punish the South African Government with a variety of specific sanctions."

□ 1420

Well, let us look at it for a second. How seriously would the South African Government take sanctions? And I really want to draw the case clearly here. If the South African Government is determined to resist Western pressure, then we have a real problem, and our problem is going to be deciding whether or not we are willing to take on the moral burden of deliberately and systematically breaking the back of the South African Government. That is not going to be easy, it is not going to be cheap, and that is a pretty heavy moral responsibility for us to take on. But if we decide to do it, we ought to do it for real. We ought to insist, we ought to say to the South African Government, "You are not going to survive as a segregationist, antiblack, white supremacist government," and we will take the steps that are necessary. And we should coordinate those steps with Japan and Australia and Europe, and we should apply those steps ruthlessly and systematically and remorselessly and should have real change. Is that what the left is proposing? Not on your life, because they know, first of all, they could never get a majority in this country for that kind of change, not at the present time. And, second, that would involve real pressure, that might well involve military action. Oh, they do not want to get involved in that, so what are they suggesting? They are suggesting that we irritate the South African Government just

enough that it does what? Moves faster than it is moving because of American pressure? In fact, it is likely to move slower because of American pressure. So what are the positive things we could be doing? And this will sound, I think, shocking to some of my friends, and it is really where I have come to in thinking about South Africa for the last 3 years and in looking at the lessons of Iran and the lessons of El Salvador.

What we should be doing is a much more active engagement than the Reagan administration. What we should be doing is saying that we are going to have a lot more scholarships so people can go to college and learn how to be leaders, we are going to have a lot more encouragement of American investment so we get more American companies in South Africa, to have more local black labor unions, to have more people working in an integrated workplace, to have more Americans sitting down there, going to the chamber of commerce meetings, going to breakfast, saying to the South Africans, "You really can integrate and be free. It is possible to have a multiracial society that is democratic." We should be increasing our engagement in our involvement with the South Africans, not decreasing it. And we should also be saying to them, "You have to understand that apartheid is going to end, that the civilized world will not tolerate it and that you are simply establishing a laboratory for Communist terrorism and for the rise of extremist black movements inside South Africa who will end up imposing a black dictatorship along the lines of Ethiopia, a Marxist-Leninist pro-Soviet dictatorship."

Now, the problem is that means we are saying as Americans that we are going to be involved in somebody else's country. But the fact is, we now live in a world where we are all involved in each other's countries, we now live in a world where it is routine for American Congressmen to show up everywhere and it is routine for other countries' leaders to show up here. We live in a world in which those people who have walked into this building today have walked past concrete blocks put up in the middle of the road because we fear terrorists in our own country. Now, if that is reality, then we need to start to come to grips with it.

What is the American position going to be over the next 10 years if we see a steady increase in left wing black activist movements in South Africa that are clearly Leninist, that are tied to the Soviet Union, that use violence and that want to impose a pro-Soviet dictatorship on South Africa? I think our position should be that we are opposed, that we will actively help the forces that want democracy.

What then should our position be across the planet? What should it be

in a complicated situation like South Korea, which is a dictatorship but pro-American? I think our position should be that we systematically and methodically encourage the development of a democracy, that we systematically encourage freedom of the press, freedom of travel, that we encourage Americans to go to pro-American dictatorships and to visit them, that we encourage church groups, that we encourage others to go, but not to go just to break the back of the dictatorship.

To replace South Korea, which is a pro-American dictatorship, with the North Korean Communist dictatorship would be a setback for human freedom in Korea, would be a threat to Japan and would be a major defeat for the survival of America in a world in which the Soviets are a real threat. To replace the current South African Government, which is a bad government, with a pro-Soviet, Leninist dictatorship would be worse, it would be worse for the people of South Africa, it would be worse for the West, it would be worse for the survival of the United States.

So the real challenge to the ostrich left of America is not how to prove you are morally courageous. Fine, do you want to pass a resolution that condemns South Africa for being a racist society? We can condemn them. But then what? Do you want to get arrested in front of their Embassy, under a procedure, by the way, in which you never really go to jail, so it is, in effect, a moving press conference? Fine. But then what? How do we then move to the next stage? And I think that is where El Salvador is so encouraging. In El Salvador we had a vicious right-wing death squad problem, and we had Communist guerrillas. And the United States went in systematically and methodically and slowly and we helped create a profreedom, pro-American, proeconomic growth, prodemocracy centrist government, which is today establishing conditions that will have a pro-American El Salvador in which human beings can live in decency and in dignity and have a better future.

The challenge to all of us is how to do two things simultaneously, how to defeat the problems of cocaine trade and terrorism and Leninist intervention, including the liberal efforts to fight the liberal wars in your neighbors, and, second, how to get governments to change when they are determined not to. And let us look at the other case, which our friends on the left will come back and say, "Well, if GINGRICH is opposed to trade sanctions in South Africa, why would he favor trade sanctions for Cuba or for Nicaragua?" And let me explain that for just a moment.

The current Communist dictatorship of Nicaragua is an unacceptable government to the United States. We

should make that clear and we should outline why in our national interest we will not accept that government, why in the interest of our survival we will not tolerate it. And we should inform that government, first, that we will not tolerate a government which is currently waging war on three countries, second, that we will not tolerate a government that is systematically allied with the Soviet Union, and, third, and in our hemisphere, in the Western Hemisphere, in a position to endanger the Panama Canal and in a position to endanger some 70 percent of our key shipping to NATO and to the Middle East coming out of Texas through the Caribbean, and, fourth, that we will not tolerate a government which only achieved power by going to the Organization of American States and promising it would hold free elections and has then established a dictatorship.

Now, people will say: Are you saying the United States has the right to interfere in other countries?

Well, in the absolute sense, yes, under international law, if we think a country is threatening our survival we do have that right. Under international law, if we think a country is waging war on one of our allies, we have the right to help our allies.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. Certainly.

Mr. CONYERS. To what provision of international law is the gentleman referring?

Mr. GINGRICH. The U.N. charter, the right of self-defense.

Mr. CONYERS. You say that Nicaragua so now threatens our defense that we now have the right to intervene in their government?

Mr. GINGRICH. I state to the gentleman unequivocally that the president of El Salvador has said flatly Nicaragua is a threat to the survival of his government, El Salvador is an ally of the United States and, therefore, in the interest of our national security, under the U.N. Charter provision for mutual response to aggression, unless you are willing to say—

Mr. CONYERS. Does the gentleman have some other citations other than the President's allegations which are in wide dispute, not only in the Congress but in America and in the world and in the United Nations?

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes; let me cite to the very distinguished gentleman the May 13, 1983, report of the House Intelligence Committee, authored by Mr. BOLAND, who is a distinguished Member of your party, who says—

Mr. CONYERS. Is the gentleman telling me that he said that we have the right to intervene internationally and militarily into Nicaragua? I am sure he did not say that.

Mr. GINGRICH. This report said unequivocally that the Nicaraguan-

Cuban contribution to the guerrilla war in El Salvador is clear, it is real, and it is a deliberate systematic effort to destroy the Government of El Salvador. This report is very clear on that.

Mr. CONYERS. In other words, the gentleman is extrapolating now that we have a right under international—

Mr. GINGRICH. No.

Mr. CONYERS. I wish the gentleman would be just a little more careful in his grandiose statements.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me be very precise.

Mr. CONYERS. I am willing to concede that there is a problem, but to stand in the well of the House, in a sober fashion, on an afternoon, and tell us that we now have the right to invade Nicaragua under international law is a little bit strong for this Member at this time of day. Now, about 8 o'clock tonight, I will buy it. But at 2:30 in the afternoon I ask my colleague from Georgia to just please be a little tempered in his statements.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I may say to my good friend—I do not want to cite authority, but as a professor of European history who has studied this stuff for a long time, let me assure the gentleman that if you are willing to define—and this may be a point which we want to discuss for a second—if you are willing to define the active training, supplying, coordination and support of guerrilla warfare as an attack on a neighbor, that is, if Nicaragua's support, active support for guerrilla warfare in El Salvador is the legal equivalent of an act of war, then there is absolutely no question that both under the Organization of American States treaty and under the U.N. Charter, there is no question, I say to the gentleman—and I will be glad to get the citations for him from people who are not in the Reagan administration—that, once you make that determination—

Mr. CONYERS. Will it be the Heritage Foundation?

Mr. GINGRICH. No; I would be glad to say to the gentleman that, as defined—I will bring people who are at Harvard and Yale, if you like—any international law scholar will tell you that legally, under those two charters, the Organization of American States charter for the Western Hemisphere and the United Nations Charter—frankly, I share the gentleman's frustration.

□ 1430

I think this administration would have been far better off to have come to this country and said flatly: "We are defining guerrilla warfare as war; we are serving notice to Nicaragua that if you destroy your neighbors' economies; if you support forces that are kidnaping mayors; if you support

forces that are destroying local city halls, that we are going to consider that an act of war, and that we are going to, under our own treaty obligations, intervene against you decisively, and we will not tolerate your destroying our allies while we do nothing.

Mr. CONYERS. May I suggest one reason why the President did not do that?

Mr. GINGRICH. Sure.

Mr. CONYERS. It will not wash.

Mr. GINGRICH. Why not?

Mr. CONYERS. It is not legal.

Mr. GINGRICH. Of course it is legal.

Mr. CONYERS. I know you have got credentials now, and they are not involved. As a professor of history, as a writer, and a theoretical analyzer of foreign policy, and you have been excellent on this subject, in terms of your energy from the day you hit the Congress, I am not in a position; I have only been a Member here for a couple of decades and gone through several wars, some of them illegal; some of them covert.

The whole point is that there are very few people who do not qualify on some point of expertise. So our credentials will have to be set aside, more or less.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am perfectly happy to do that.

Mr. CONYERS. I will set my meager ones aside if you will set your very larger ones aside.

Mr. GINGRICH. You clearly have been a participant in this Congress through a great deal of the history that I studied, so it is a great pleasure to have you bring personal witness.

Would you explain to me under what provision is it illegal, once you have, notice the way I have set this up now, once you agree that Nicaragua is actively supporting guerrilla warfare in El Salvador. I mean, if the case is a question of fact, I would agree with you; if Nicaragua just wants to be a Communist dictatorship, we have no legal grounds to intervene. That would be an act of aggression.

But once Nicaragua starts to mug its neighbor, I would say to my friend, then tell me under what rule of law we do not have the right to intervene decisively to stop that?

Mr. CONYERS. I would be glad to make that announcement. I thought no one would ever ask me today.

There is no such law. That is why nobody cites one, not even yourself. There is no law that exists. We cannot intervene under those circumstances. But the fact circumstances are not accurate to begin with.

Mr. GINGRICH. Why not? Do you not agree that Nicaragua is systematically—

Mr. CONYERS. Mugging its neighbor? No; I have not. If I did, I would come here with even greater sympathy

in my heart for the gentleman's position on this matter.

Mr. GINGRICH. So you disagree with the Intelligence Committee's report?

Mr. CONYERS. You have already distorted Mr. BOLAND's comments in one respect; I certainly do not want to assume that you and I agree on what the Intelligence Committee said. I have a lot of good friends on that committee, as does my colleague.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me read to you then, because I do not want to distort anything. Let me read you just a couple of sentences and I want you to respond.

Mr. CONYERS. Let me read it and then at our earliest convenience we will continue the discussion.

Mr. GINGRICH. That is very fair and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to interject.

Mr. GINGRICH. I wish you would, if you get a chance, look at the Organization of American States, I am not sure which article, and then look at the U.S. Charter, both of which contain specific provisions for nations and their allies to respond to aggression. The case I am making here this afternoon that makes, I think, Nicaragua and Cuba different, is I am making the specific assertion which I think is long overdue in this country, that they are systematically engaged in aggression and the correct term for that is an act of war. That they are waging war on El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, and that American policy should occur in the context of a deliberate Communist war in Central America, and as long as we muck it up and have it confusing and murky, I agree with the gentleman. I think you have helped clarify today, and I would like to arrange, at your convenience, maybe next week, for a special order that we might share to continue this dialog.

Mr. CONYERS. I appreciate this immensely. Does the gentleman recommend that ultimately that we declare war on Nicaragua?

Mr. GINGRICH. I would say to my distinguished friend that if, at the end of helping the freedom fighters; if at the end of doing everything we can to weaken the Government of Nicaragua; if that Government is sitting there, and it is determined to wage war on its neighbors, and we have absolute proof of that point, that it has troops fighting in Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, I would then say to the gentleman: What would you suggest?

Mr. CONYERS. Well, if the matter is as urgent as you suggest, I must say that you are far more restrained than I originally thought as I rushed to this microphone.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think we are a great Nation.

Mr. CONYERS. I see that you are holding yourself back from the ultimate natural, logical consequence of your argument.

Mr. GINGRICH. If the gentleman had heard the earlier part of my talk, as I was quoting from Abba Eban, the former Israeli Foreign Minister, he would know that one of my points is that a great power, if we are going to move toward an integrated, free South Africa, which I share the gentleman's passion for; if we are going to move toward a free Nicaragua; if we are going to move over time on the Philippines and South Vietnam, my central point was, we have to learn to be patient and methodical and to use our force in a systematic manner that people across the planet come to respect.

So I would say to the gentleman, yes, I think this Government should say to the Nicaraguan Communists, you have a problem. You are not going to make it, given your current behavior, and we are going to continue to raise the ante fairly rapidly over the next 2 or 3 years until you are gone, unless you change your behavior.

Mr. CONYERS. Would the gentleman reserve any recommendation of a declaration of war until we have had our discussion?

Mr. GINGRICH. Oh, I do not think we need to declare war for a long time.

Mr. CONYERS. On that note, I very happily and optimistically withdraw from the discussion.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask you a question for a second because I have forgotten and I should know this: What year did you come here?

Mr. CONYERS. The age of man, I think the records may have become lost and destroyed; there is some question about it.

Mr. GINGRICH. The gentleman has so much less gray hair than I do that it is very discouraging for him to point out to this audience whatever length he has been here and to make comments like that.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman is very kind. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am a mere junior. But my impression was that, were you here during the last phase of the Vietnam war?

Mr. CONYERS. I believe that I was.

Mr. GINGRICH. The reason I am asking, seriously, is because there is an argument which Harry Summers makes in his book on Vietnam. That if we were going to have done that, we would have been far wiser to have done what the gentleman says. That had we declared war in Vietnam; had we been explicit about it.

Mr. CONYERS. To have done what you would have recommended under those circumstances.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, if you are going to be involved, I mean, the other option which I think is equally discus-

sable would have been to have pulled out totally. To just say that we are not going to be there.

But to have been halfway there, that is, to have been there and not to lose 58,000 Americans and to devastate the countryside, and then not have won was the worst of all worlds. I guess I am saying to my distinguished colleague, and I would say also to the administration is: There is no future in this county in developing in Central America a slow-motion Bay of Pigs. We should either say we are going to accommodate the Nicaraguans no matter what they do, and allow them to get away with everything they are doing, or we should act much more decisively and much more explicitly.

I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was listening with interest to your description of the Nicaraguan behavior in the region, and I was interested specifically in the question Mr. CONYERS asked about the authority that you cite that would describe the current conditions under which we, as a country, would have the right to invade the country of Nicaragua for the purpose of replacing their government.

The facts, of course, are in dispute about what is happening in the region; you believe perhaps one set of facts and others see a different set of facts. But what is the authority that would suggest to us that we now, given a relatively common set of facts, have the right to invade the country of Nicaragua?

Mr. GINGRICH. Now, I did not say anything, the gentleman from Michigan, I think, was talking about invasion; I have not at any point today, talked about using American troops and frankly do not think they are necessary.

□ 1440

What I have said is that if Nicaragua wages war on its neighbors, and we could discuss some day what is the evidence and whether or not that is true, but if they are waging war on Honduras, in Guatemala, in El Salvador, which I believe they are, that we in the West have to define an effective response which prevents them from successfully doing that, and that we currently have no successful system for doing that.

My whole point earlier in my speech was to say that we need a whole new set of ideas and language and approach, but we first have to decide, and this is why I would like to get the gentleman's reaction, frankly, if I could convince you that Nicaragua was systematically waging war using guerrillas, would you then agree that the United States clearly, under the U.N

Charter, and the charter of the Organization of American States, has the right to work with its allies so that they can actively protect themselves against aggression, including going to the source of the aggression?

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, did the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota wish me to yield to him for some further comments?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Yes; I would appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The discussion that was just going on in the well that the gentleman from Texas was listening to and that I was listening to was interesting. It was discussing our role in Central America and the conditions under which we might or might not get involved. I say that in some respect there is a distinction without great difference in deciding to commit American troops to go fight in Nicaragua or deciding to hire some other troops with American money to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua.

But let me say this: I have been to that region, as have many other Members of the House, and there is a claim that Nicaragua exports revolution. There is some small evidence of that.

There are other claims that the United States imports revolution into Nicaragua, and there is some evidence of that.

There are claims and counterclaims going on. I do not know to what extent there is gun running between Nicaragua and El Salvador. I have tried to find that out. There are a lot of allegations about it but not a lot of hard evidence. If I believe there is some gun-running going back and forth, obviously I want to do what I can to stop it. But I was down in the Gulf of Fonseca in the little horseshoe between Honduras and El Salvador and Nicaragua and a navy colonel from the Honduran Navy was describing the fast boats that they have to patrol the Gulf of Fonseca because the allegation is that there are these tons of weapons moving through the Gulf of Fonseca from Nicaragua to El Salvador.

So we took a look at these boats. We saw the machineguns. We saw how fast they were and how impressive it all was, and I asked the colonel, "How long have you been patrolling these waters in the Gulf of Fonseca in order to interdict?" It is an interdiction program for arms.

He said, "Oh, about 18 months."

I said, "What kind of arms have you interdicted so far? Could you give me a description of the cache of arms in

this pipeline of arms transaction between Nicaragua and El Salvador that you have interdicted?"

He said, "Well, we have not really interdicted any arms at this point."

I said, "Now, wait a second. You tell me that the Gulf of Fonseca is a major artery by which arms are transported from Nicaragua to El Salvador. You have the fast boats in here, and you are telling me you have the best program available, but you have not found any arms yet? Does that say something to you?"

"Well," he said, "It says to me maybe we have cut off the arms shipments."

Well, maybe so; I would give them that. Maybe there were substantial arms moving and maybe the presence of these boats, and so on, have cut off the arms shipments. But I find it a little bit unusual for us to go to the region, you, myself, to go to the region and hear, for example, an Ambassador talk about what is going on, and you ask the Ambassador a question, and you say, "Well, now, we have groups that are headquartered in Honduras or Costa Rica and moving up into Nicaragua to destabilize that Government. That is moving terror in one direction. We scream when it moves in other directions, but we wink when it moves in our direction."

All I am saying that I think all of us probably start from the same premise: We do not want communism to get a foothold in Central America. We move from that premise and that goal toward a series of actions that we think would best serve our interests, the interests of the United States, and best serve the interests of the people in that region in our foreign policy.

The reason that I have been interested in this is that I fervently believe that the action by the Reagan administration in Central America is action that is completely and totally counterproductive to our interests in the region and will, in fact, move the Nicaraguans ever closer to the Soviets. I do believe that we need to be involved in Central America in a constructive role, but I have been there, and people are hungry, they need something to eat, they are sick, they need medicine, they are illiterate, they need education.

The last thing we need to do is send more guns and more bullets to 13- and 15-year-olds up on a mountain someplace so they can shoot somebody. I just believe there are better approaches to the Central American problem than this administration is pursuing, which will result in our best interest, result in oppressing the Communist movement in that region, and result in serving the best interests of the people of Central America as well.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just add that the problem we have is that communism already has a foothold in Central America. The Nicaraguan Government is clearly a Leninist government. It could hardly get much closer to the Soviets, for all practical purposes. They are building a Soviet airfield. They have Soviet advisers. They are using Soviet equipment. I am not sure they could do much more than they are already doing.

Second, interdiction is working. Earlier in my special order I cited today's New York Times, page 1. I cited a column in the Washington Times by an eminent national columnist which talked about the fact that there is less there.

But notice the problem here for a second. On the floor of this House, right there, 2 weeks ago I showed two American rifles from Vietnam that had been shipped from North Vietnam to Cuba to Nicaragua and El Salvador. They were captured in El Salvador. I showed a Bulgarian rifle round manufactured at factory No. 10. I showed a Soviet hand grenade which was part of a box of hand grenades, half of which went to Grenada from Cuba, half of which went from Cuba to Nicaragua to El Salvador and were picked up in El Salvador. I showed a North Vietnamese mortar sight, my point being this to the gentleman, and I will be glad to take the gentleman not very far from here and show him a cache of weapons which the Salvadoran army has captured. Nobody disputes them.

They got there somehow, and they did not get there by Pan American taking them as CARE packages. They came through Nicaragua. The El Salvadorans affirm it. Our own intelligence affirms it, and the only question, I would say to the gentleman, is this: We are dealing with a Nicaraguan Communist dictatorship which has said unequivocally it is allied with the Soviet Union, which has said unequivocally that it is committed to a regional war, and which is currently, at this very minute while you and I talk, waging war in Guatemala, in Honduras, and in El Salvador.

I think I can provide overwhelming proof for that. If that is true, what then are we going to do about it? My point, and I will concede it is a very tough point, my point is that as the greatest power in the Western Hemisphere, we have an obligation to our allies to protect them not just by trying to stop the Nicaraguans from destroying their country, which by the way in El Salvador so far this year has led to 10 mayors being kidnaped and 35 city halls being burned, but also to say to the Nicaraguans, "If you are

going to beat up on our friends, then we are going to come after you. You are not going to be safe in Nicaragua and have the right to go ahead and kill allies of America in three countries while we are passive."

Mr. DORGAN OF North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas would yield for 1 more minute, the gentleman from Texas has been someone who has spoken on this issue many times, and speaks on the floor of the House a great deal, and I appreciate his yielding to me to respond one more time and say that if the gentleman from Georgia believes that the Nicaraguan Government poses such a threat to this country and to this hemisphere, the kind of threat that has been described by, I think, some Members on his side of the aisle particularly, and some in the administration, then you ought to gas up the tanks and gas up the trucks and get moving and get down there and clear things out, if it is that kind of a threat.

□ 1450

The fact is that it is not that kind of a threat. Communism is a problem in Central America. When you say it has a foothold in Nicaragua, well, we could quibble about what the word "foothold" means. Cuba has 900 physicians in Nicaragua, and they have a couple of thousand teachers, and so on, there.

But let me say this: When we as Americans decide we have a problem in Central America and decide we need to take some action to try to respond to that problem, what we desperately need to do is move bilaterally, move in concert with other countries in that region, with the consent and acceptance of other leaders in this world. What we too often do is develop unilateral behavior.

The trade embargo is an interesting example. Just recently we decided what we are going to do. We have been hiring these armies up in the mountains. And I have seen 11-year-old kids with new American rifles up there that our CIA has paid for, wearing nice new, clean, pressed uniforms. That was, incidentally, just an American CIA initiative to fund an army. Now we are saying that what we are going to do is have a trade embargo. We did not consult anybody; we do not have other countries in the region supporting it.

In fact, about 17 of the last world leaders that our President has met with in recent months, about 17 out of 17, have not supported this country's initiatives in Central America. Why? Because I think those initiatives are initiatives that those world leaders—not Communist leaders, just other government world leaders—see as initiatives that will not really work.

What we need to do when we get involved is to do something that will

work. Why a trade embargo that will not work? Why a trade embargo that is unilateral? Why one that is not supported by our allies?

Why? Because somebody downtown said: "Let's do this for a while." That is not a coordinated, thoughtful response to our responsibilities in the hemisphere and to the problems that exist in the region.

Let me say, finally, that I do not like the Sandinistas very much. I have talked to them. I find their censorship of the press to be something that is detestable to me. I am not crazy about the Sandinistas at all, but neither am I crazy about this Government's policies, as articulated by this administration, in which they believe that by following these courses of using hired armies and trade embargoes, and so on, we will eventually straighten out that problem. In my opinion, there are better ways.

I do not think that we ought to have no policy. We need a policy, but I think the current policy is wrong. We need to carve out a better policy because there is a better way.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I mean that sincerely. I thank both gentlemen, because this is an issue that, as I have been trying to say for some time now—to be precise, April 1, 1980, at which time President Carter was the President—should be on the priority list for consideration. I am delighted at the participation of Members who showed up at this late hour, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Members have gone out of the city on various missions, and for that reason we had no legislative business today.

Yet I feel that I have been impelled to speak loud and long, perhaps to the dislike of some, on this matter because of its prime urgency and also because of the fact that I have been addressing the House here for some time under the general title of "My advice to the Privileged Orders" of our country, in a rather weak imitation of a great and noble American, Joel Barlow, a great revolutionary figure, and a great thinker of the day, and a writer, and poet who lived under somewhat similar conditions at the time, if we can make comparisons, and spoke out with his advice to the privileged orders and of the need for change, revolutionary change.

As I see it, these issues that are here today discussed very emphatically reflect the line of thought that has been agitating the minds of our national leaders in and out of the Congress and in and out of the Presidency and evince to me a rather serious misconception, and perception, or misperception of the reality of the world, particularly that world that we share with these countries to the south of us. In light of the discussion and in pursuance of my advice to the privi-

leged orders, I would like to point out some facts.

I have been attempting, on a 1-minute basis, to pursue in a sustained way what I call a dose of reality with respect to the situation in Nicaragua. I have pointed out where tragically we have been in gross violation of solemn treaties that we are party signatory to, and that has brought down world opinion against us. And I think the RECORD ought to show, in light of this discussion today, that the 25 nations that share the New World with us today, as reported in our newspapers today, though buried on page 23, announced a solidly passed and signed resolution of protest to the United States with reference to the recently proposed embargo by President Ronald Reagan.

The President announced that embargo on the eve of his departure to the Bonn economic summit meeting in Germany recently, and some critics interpreted that as a means of defusing the loud clamor and dissension which his trip and his announced visit to the cemetery in Germany had aroused.

But I do not like to question motives. I have always assumed that every colleague and every President that I have had the honor and privilege to work with—and that is a total of six—had honorable motives. And I want to say also by way of explanation that when the two gentleman, the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Georgia, were involved in the dialog preceding my special order, they were referring to membership in this body and the length of it, and let me say that mine has now reached the point of the 24th year. I have been very privileged to serve in this very, very honorable body, the most important body of its kind in the world, one in which we cannot find any comparison. Cognizant of that high honor and privilege and grateful as I am for these processes, I am very sensitive about the things that have happened over the course of the years that have represented intrusions into this great participatory democracy in a way that I believe is contrary to all of the thinking and the basis of our Government, as reflected in the deliberations of the constitutional conventions in the late 1780's, in which by these great processes we had this magnificent result known as the U.S. Constitution.

So I have watched six Presidents. I have not hesitated to speak out when I feared that some recommendation of a President—and I am speaking now of every one of the six, from John Kennedy to Ronald Reagan—has caused me to think that it is wrong, that it is contrary to the best interests of or the greatest interests of the greatest number in America. As close, and personal, and intimate friendship as I did

have the honor of developing with John Kennedy, I did not hesitate for 1 minute to record my vote and speak in explanation of that vote in a manner that was inconsistent with his recommendations or those of his then administration, what his administration called his congressional-White House liaison assistants. It was the same with an equally dear friend and neighbor of mine, President Lyndon Johnson.

What I heard today is reminiscent of that period. And I have not hesitated, beginning with April 1, 1980, at which time certainly Ronald Reagan was not the President, to speak out because of my forebodings. And it has given me no satisfaction whatsoever to say, "Well, I told you so," because if anybody is interested in examining what I said on April 1—and I said it right here on this floor for the RECORD—they will see that I was predicting to the President that if he persisted in a unilateral course, without first seeking the recourse of our treaty obligations under the Rio Pact, as well as the Montevideo agreement, as well as the Punta del Este understanding, and as well as, more importantly, the OAS Treaty, we would soon squander the last little vestige of leverage we had for collective leadership, moral as well as real leadership in this New World.

□ 1500

Regretfully, I also said that I would give that time no more than 90 days because of the development then in El Salvador following the revolution in 1979 in Nicaragua.

Now, it pains me very much to see that the same essential parameters of judgment-making evaluations are still ruling supreme in our country; though let me say that I am afraid that the real power of decision is no longer being reached within the Halls of the Congress, and much to my regret, even outside of the Oval Office of the Presidency, we now have in place a tremendous oligarchical power that is in reality exercising the power of decision in the all-important matters of fiscal monetary policies, which incidentally are the basis for the developments about which this great conflict and dissension and discussion concerning Central America and other points in the world is really about.

We can really say that these are the basic things that have given rise to these concerns about what truly is the national interest and to what extent it is involved and to what extent it is in jeopardy.

Some of us have been pointing out in both respects for some time that the question of jeopardy and danger had long ago reared its ugly head, but it has been to no avail to speak out and bring some consequent reaction reflected either in the deliberations here or the considerations in the White House.

As I have said, I have had the privilege of working with six different Presidents. I do not use the word or the preposition "and" or "under" six Presidents, because this is a word that is being used more and more by Members of the Congress and by the general American public, giving rise to a very, very noxious concept that the Presidency for some reason or other is supreme, forgetting that the true nature of our government under the Constitution is based on a tri-partite division of powers of government, that ours, the Representative, the Congress, is article I of the Constitution. Obviously that was placed as article I for a good purpose, that the Office of the Presidency, for example, was not even contemplated during the first actual 10 years of actual existence. Nobody even wanted to conceive of that Office until the deliberations in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia and then when it was finally debated and the term first used was not "President" or "Presidency." It was "Chief Magistrate."

Finally the decision was made that it was necessary after the experience with the First and Second Continental Congresses and the Articles of Confederation that such an Office obviously would be necessary; but for good reason very definite powers were placed exclusively in that first branch in the Congress.

The basic premise is that each branch is coequal, independent, and separate; so this notion when we say that we worked under President so and so is noxious to our basic conscience. We work with and I think it is indispensable that insofar as possible that these branches work in conformity, that neither one nor the other arrogate to itself supra or ultra vires or transconstitutional powers.

This is what the issue is today and has been very much definitely since the so-called World War II, which incidentally we forget has not really ended. We tend to forget that there is no formal treaty of peace or agreement that would resolve definitely World War II.

What did happen was that the active shooting phase did stop with the overwhelming and total victory of the Allies and the conquest of Germany, and Italy, and its allies, but the war has not ended. We have 300,000 troops in Germany alone. We have not even begun to have a glimmer of a policy as to what we would do in negotiations with the Allies with whom we were able to defeat the totalitarian forces; so that given that, we should be very mindful that we are living in a totally different world from what our basic defense policies—and I do not call them policies because they really are not—diplomatic approaches which have failed.

We never, no nation does, resort to the military or to force, if you please, unless and until the failure of diplomacy.

I think it is tragic that two Presidents, although I cannot say that President Carter did so totally, as totally as President Reagan, who in effect has been conducting war in Central America, beginning with the massive military buildup, the greatest in the history of this region of the world, with 30,000 of our military in land, and the sea, and the air surrounding the Central American area, particularly Nicaragua.

Certainly we ought to realize that since the era of Vietnam we have had certain laws approved by the Congress that would try to define, and defuse, and prevent what has been called Presidential wars.

Obviously, I would not be motivated to the introduction of a resolution alleging that the President is in violation of the War Powers Limitation Act as I have in the case of Central America and as I did in the case of Lebanon and Beirut for 1 year and almost 14 months before the murder of the marines.

How did that come about? It was simply incredible to think that under the prior system to the 1947 Reorganization Act in defense and under the old system of the old Department of War, the Secretary of War, that such things as that would have happened; but under this system, which I believe has been a mistake and I have been saying so since I came to the Congress, to have had considered as final, that is, the Reorganization Act of 1947 which gave rise to the Defense Department, a Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

How could we have achieved professional militarists, all the main lead elements of our components in the military, forming and constituting the Joint Chiefs of Staff, advising the President that they were unanimous in their advice against his use of the Marines in Beirut?

How can we say that a Commander in Chief, for the Constitution vests that title in our President, would have willfully, knowingly, ignored that advice for 14 months, ending in the slaughter of 241 of our noble, best warriors.

To what avail was it for us to take this floor? I wish then my colleagues could have come here and joined in some little discussion, because it is fine to get up here and talk about something that has transpired, but it is another thing to get here and say: "I anticipate this for this reason and this is what I think we can do now"—not later.

This is where I would like to come today in my advice to the privileged orders. In the first place, if a President

seeks to define a policy that will bring about an understanding among our people as to the nature of the cause that he is asking us to rise to and support, especially if the military had been called in, a clear indication that our diplomacy has failed.

□ 1510

If, as the Scriptures say, the trumpets sound an uncertain sound, who then, who then can come forth and summon and unite behind an unclear trumpet call to battle? The whole problem continues to be this vagueness of mission.

When I got here evening after evening for 14 months and directed my inquiry to the President, mindful of the fact that I had written several letters to the President from the very beginning in 1981, but this is one of the six Presidents that does not reply to a Member of Congress' letter. It is the first President I have worked with that has this as a practice. So after I had received absolute verifiable information from members of the service who happened to be my constituents, who have been in service for years on the isthmus in Central America, and came to me in early September 1979 on a confidential, private basis, frustrated, concerned, worried because they could not get any kind of a message through the bureaucracy, and they thought well, our Congressman, maybe he ought to be able to have some access, maybe to the President himself.

I found I could not. But everything these men told me was absolutely true, and what they predicted happened exactly as they said, which, again, was reminiscent to me of 1960, in December, I was still a State Senator and I had information from a distinguished member of the Texas business community on the border who had been intimately involved in Cuba during the 1920's and the 1930's and had married a distinguished member of Cuban society, and told me that he wanted me to meet with a former distinguished Cuban jurist who had been a member of the World Court and was in exile in Miami, and he wanted me to intercede with President Kennedy, with whom he knew I had an intimate friendship. I had just completed campaigning in 11 States in behalf of the Kennedy-Johnson ticket.

In effect what he was telling me was that this distinguished jurist had this troubling information that the CIA had invested over \$2.5 million in the Miami area alone preparing for an invasion of Cuba, that there were similar preparations in Nicaragua and other points in Central America, that the invasion would not work, that he even knew the date of the sailing of the ships for the purposes of invading. Also that Castro knew, himself, because he had managed to infiltrate

these groups, that even if these groups managed to succeed in that invasion and overwhelm the Castro forces in Cuba, they would not be able to govern Cuba because they could not even get together themselves in Miami. That unless the United States was prepared to go in itself and occupy and govern Cuba, no other way could be found for the United States to do it by delegation of authority, and especially to any component or aggregation of those that were seeking the invasion.

It so happened that I did, I contacted President Kennedy's personal secretary and made arrangements to go with these people and meet the President at Bergstrom Air Force Base. He was at that time, it was December 11, 1960, the President was at West Palm Beach, FL and he was going to fly into Austin, TX at Bergstrom Air Force Base and then from there go visit Vice President Lyndon Johnson elect at his so-called ranch.

I arranged for this group on the following day to go to Bergstrom Air Force Base and would be permitted to visit with the President from 15 minutes to half an hour. But first the secretary wanted to make sure that I knew what I was doing, that I could respond for these individuals and that the President would in no way be embarrassed. I assured him of that.

However, to my great disappointment and surprise, the next day when I was supposed to have met this Cuban former jurist and this Texas businessman, the Cuban did not show up and as it later turned out he had been diverted by some of the conspirators who had found out that he was coming to San Antonio, TX for some unknown purpose, but which perhaps they did not trust.

As a result, I had to call and cancel the visit.

Subsequent to that the same request was made on the basis that this distinguished businessman in Texas assured me that President-elect Kennedy knew nothing about what had already been undertaken for about 1 year since about January 1959, and that it was on its course, that it was irreversible, that the President really did not know that this was something that the CIA had totally prepared on its own since the last year of President Eisenhower's regime.

I then suggested that I did not want to have anything more to do with that, that they resort to one of our Texas State Senators to seek that appointment with the President. I felt that I had gone far enough.

But nobody can imagine the travail I felt in mind and soul when the following February, on the exact date and the exact hour that this gentleman had told me in December the invasion would take place, it happened, with the results we all know.

I say that under the old system before reorganization in 1947, and this is something I had said even before then when I was in the State Senate, that we had created in our hierarchical scheme of things in our Government a situation where if the military expertise were called upon that that military expertise judgment would not have that input of evaluation that it should.

We read the memoirs of General Ridgeway who, if you read those memoirs, will tell you that he singlehanded, when he was a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff representing the Army, and the Eisenhower administration was posing the question about direct intervention in what was then called Indochina, Southeast Asia, the memoirs tell us that General Ridgeway said, "Look, this is something, allow me, before you make a decision," because he confesses in his memoirs that the majority were about to go along with that decision, he said, "First hold up and allow me to bring the logistics of the situation." In other words, the reality. And he brought in his logisticians and they pointed out 8,000 miles of line of communication and supply line, the difficult area of troop activity from a hill standpoint where there were jungle diseases that even the greatest scientific epidemiologists had not even yet quite ascertained. He pointed out that it would be a quagmire in which our troops would disappear unless we were willing to go in what would be tantamount to an out and out declaration of war.

This is the talk I heard today, and the logistics are the same.

What is it we seek in Nicaragua? Ideological purity?

The President no less than 1 month ago, when thwarted by his request for money for the so-called Contras, was publicly soliciting and encouraging private groups to raise personal mercenaries and moneys to be used. In what?

□ 1520

In what? In not exacting ideological purity but in the overthrow of the Nicaraguan Government which, after the November elections last year, is to all intents and purposes throughout the world established as a legitimate regime. We cannot properly call it a Sandinista regime any longer. The Sandinista regime was the junta that operated until the election last November.

But let us forget about ideological purity because if this is what it is, and this was what it was when we got involved in it not only in Vietnam but prior to that in Korea, with the significant difference of when President Truman did introduce American troops he did so under the aegis, under

the name of the United Nations. We had some world opinion behind us.

In the case of Indochina we never did. We went into a situation in which we were having and witnessing a civil war within a religious war within that ideological war, but mostly a civil war.

In Nicaragua we have the identical situation. And nobody, even President Reagan does not deny that the revolution in Nicaragua was made, was indigenous, was not imposed by external forces, whether Castro or Cubans or Russians or anybody else. But let us think for a moment; let us say, and I believe the President is on an irreversible course of war, that he has been involved in acts of war; if the Nicaraguan Government were to come and mine Chesapeake Bay, would we consider that an act of war? Well, we have done that. We had mined the harbors of Nicaragua.

We talk about defending friendly allies. We are occupying Honduras without the express invitation of the representatives of the Honduran people. In fact we are very heavily criticized. There is great dissension even within the governing bodies in Honduras. In the case of the so-called Contras that the President so mischievously has called freedom fighters, you have great dissension. The greatest number of that motley crew consists of ex-Somocista national guardsmen.

Now let us assume that they would have the capability, and let us not forget at this point that General Paul Gorman, the outgoing Commander of the Southern Command, said right at the point that he was retiring as commander that there was no way that the Contras could knock over the Nicaraguan Government. But let us assume that is the decision. Let us assume that we finally come to our senses and we decide to get military expertise, I know for a fact, as I knew at the time though it was never published that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were solidly against the deployment of the marines by President Reagan in Beirut. I know now that no professional American military will tell you that it will take less than 100,000 of our troops in a direct involvement of the U.S. Forces. Now what does that mean? Let us be realistic. It means we would have to pull forces from somewhere, from the 45,000 we have in South Korea, or the 300,000 in Germany or those in the Middle East area. Nobody talks about the 2,000 American troops we have in the Sinai Desert. Everybody has forgotten about them. The significant difference of that mission being that for the first time in its history the Congress mandated that deployment of that military.

Who was here to debate that? Twelve Members. I was chastised by the then and much lamented chair-

man of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who had admonished me not to say anything, he did not want anybody to start trouble, he said; but I had to rise for the record and raise my voice and ask the question which I am still asking. Now, we pull those troops and we go into what obviously will be a corner-by-corner, street-by-street guerrilla type warfare with a people that the Nicaraguan Government has given arms to every family. They have built sandbag barricades on the street corners and the barrios of Managua. They are fully expecting an invasion on the part of American troops.

We will, of necessity, have to kill civilians, men, women, children.

Now let us say we succeed and we knock out the Government of Nicaragua, who is going to govern Nicaragua? The Contras? They would not last a day, unless we were there like we did with Somoza for 40 years, to shore them up. First impose him and then shore him up.

Well now is that democracy? Is that government by the just consent of the governed?

So we have to be realistic. This is what I have been trying to bring out, futilely during the Vietnam era. I did not wait until it was popular to be against the war, and it was difficult because it involved a very dear friend in the person of President Lyndon Johnson. But I was the one raising the issue, salutarily, in the Congress about the use of unwilling conscripts or draftees in undeclared wars outside of the continental United States. This was a proviso that was an integral part of the first peacetime draft act that was approved by the Congress by one vote, and only after that proviso was inserted in the law.

Well, who cared? Who cared as long as in the middle of 1965 I rose and pointed out that at that point in August 1965 over 45 percent, approximately 47 percent of those involved that would likely see combat were draftees, and of that the overwhelming preponderant majority were poor, poor members that had been drafted, that had no way of going to college and get exempted or had the sophisticated ways of taking courses like the Harvard students did on how to dodge the draft. And they died. The casualties started to come in.

It was not until we were forced to dip into those sources of manpower that came from the middle class and the upper class of our classes that then we began to have some serious questioning about the war.

Now I think that that is wrong. I did not think we should have waited. I think we should have examined then and we should have asked the paramount question: What is the mission of our military?

□ 1530

What was going to be our role in the midst of a civil war, forgetting about resisting Communist aggression. But what was the perception of the world, then, as it is now on the part of the wielders of power at this moment, with respect to Latin America?

The President very clearly expressed it when he said: I'm going to make those Sandinistas yell uncle. As if he were President Coolidge in 1929, when we last sent the Marines and then stayed there 9 years in order to install the Somoza regime and form the national guard, and then keep them in power for 40 years.

Now those days are gone forever, because that world is gone. They are gone forever. We also forget that logistically, even in Vietnam, with our massive presence of half a million of our military and with all of the modern weaponry we could muster, including one feature, complete control of the airspace. We could not and we did not win.

But what were we talking about, what were we trying to win? Certainly the American people did not understand it. How can a great national leader such as the President invoke war without first making sure that the people were susceptible to developing the will to fight, and fight in a united way?

This is why some historians are beginning to call World War II the last good war, which I think is a horrible, horrible misuse of words. There are no good wars, ever.

If that was meant to mean that there was a firm resolve, that the bulge sounded clearly and forthrightly and that that call was responded to, I recall there was not any one of us at that time that wasn't lining up—not to get drafted; to volunteer.

I hear parents telling me today, "Henry, my boy is not going to go to the draft anyplace, I'll tell you that now." And I said "Well, don't tell me." I have been saying that; it is not the point. The point is that you do not know. You do not know what you will be asking your boy to do, because we cannot foretell what will develop. All we can tell you, at least I, is that if we continue along a certain course of action, that inevitably this is going to happen.

This is why I said before the election last year that sometime before the election, depending on whether or not there was political trouble for the candidates, we would see headlines. But certainly right after the election we would see headlines saying, Mig's in Nicaragua, and everybody would be saying we had better do something.

We have had U.S. Senators saying, Well, this is amply cause for us to go in. I say now, it will not be long before we will have a similar headline, except

far more alarming, and the reason is that we have put in play forces.

For example, the week before last, a Honduran airplane that we supplied through the CIA, the Department of Defense last September 18 publicly stated that it had turned over what it called "excess warplanes" and military material to the CIA.

Now that posed two questions: The CIA, under the National Security Act of 1947, is not empowered as a paramilitary group. Yet no one has questioned it. Mine has been the only voice to even report that. This troubles me. There is no satisfaction in saying my voice was the only one; that is a very questionable type of boast, if I were to consider it such.

Let us pursue the point. This Honduran airplane sank a Nicaraguan patrol boat in Nicaraguan waters, not Honduran waters. Now there will be a limit beyond which any country, including the Nicaraguan regime, is going to do something, that we then will use as a pretext to say that we must defend the sovereignty of that nation; our ally Honduras, very much along the line that was spoken today, this afternoon.

I fully expect that headline. What happened last November? One day after the election, you had the beginning of what 2 days later was a headline: Mig's in Nicaragua. Then what happened 1 week later? The President was compelled to come out and say, "I don't know where that got started; that was a bad leak somewhere, but I'm not saying those are Mig's. There was something else in the bottom of those ships."

Why would I have predicted that? Was I a prophet, was I a seer? No; but I had received information that the CIA was, on a sustained basis, conducting attempts to assassinate the leaders of the Nicaraguan Government.

I was invited—I have not traveled down there. In fact, the reason is that all of this reminds me of Vietnam. I used to see some of my colleagues from Texas put on khaki, like the Governor of Texas did last month or the beginning days of this month, and went down and took chili con carne from his meat business and tamales and enchiladas and what not down to Honduras.

He put on khaki and a Westmoreland cap, and that is what I remember some of my colleagues from Texas saying, "Henry, you've got to come with us and go to Vietnam." I would say "No; I don't have to go to Vietnam. I have an overwhelming, disproportionate number of constituents that are over there. I wish I could pull them out."

I wanted to tell my two colleagues this afternoon who were talking about this great threat, that when the President announced the embargo, the newspapers very carefully left out

what he had to establish as a finding of fact before he could impose the embargo. Under the law, the President has to say that Nicaragua is an emergency matter, a national emergency and a direct threat to our national interest and safety.

Now as I said earlier, it was obviously from the beginning a failure policy. Twenty-five countries of the new world today released this resolution condemning the President's action in invoking an embargo. All of the European allies, even at the conference in Germany, told the President that they were not going to go along; in fact, they were going to continue their trade and economic relations and some commitments of aid that they had already made to the Nicaraguan regime.

I say this is identically the same thing that we saw during the terrible conflict in South Vietnam in which we lost untold billions in Treasury and a lot of blood; 50,000 plus of our youth.

I believe that, had we had the correct perception of the world we would not have. Had we felt at the time that this was not a monolithic Communist world, that there was a history of war and animosity and conflict between Russia and China and between China and Vietnam, would we have proceeded under that assumption?

Would it have been wise? Why was it that even since Korea—the Soviets—Russia never had to put a live and kicking Russian soldier, much less a platoon into war involving Americans fighting Asians. Why? I asked that question before I came to the Congress. Actually, because diplomacy was a total failure.

What do we accomplish if we invoke military? What is it, then, that we seek as a mission? If our soldier does not understand clearly what his mission is to be, how can we expect him to fight with the support and that type of backing that is so necessary to the fighting man?

If his support back home is confused and divided, if the leadership is unclear in its motives and goals and aims, how then can we expect success or that precious thing we call victory?

If we do not know what we are fighting for, if it is ideological, then we ought to have known since we invaded with France and England, Russia in 1918, to try to put down their revolution, that that will not succeed, that we cannot impose in the case of an indigenous, a native civil war, our people who will be governing.

We cannot, and we cannot ever bomb communism out of existence. The only answer to communism is social justice, nothing else.

I think it should be noted for the record that in both the Salvadoran elections and the Nicaraguan elections, you had candidates representing the Marxist-Leninist or Communist

party. In either case, they did not even get 6 percent.

If we are worried about, in the last junta the two or three Marxist-Leninists in the Junta, forget the three priests that were in that same junta; and say Well, they ought to be ideologically pure; we cannot tolerate having a Marxist-Leninist, then what do we do about France?

□ 1540

France has two Communists in its Cabinet. Why do we not invade France? Why do we not try to purify France?

Well, because the absurdity of it hits us. So then what is and what should be our mission? Why is it that we have dozens of my colleagues traveling down to Nicaragua and El Salvador and almost everyone coming back with an entirely different impression? This is reminiscent of Vietnam. I remember some of my Texas colleagues who did go, and one would come back and say, "Well, you know, that South Vietnamese regime is corrupted, we will not be able to do any good, we ought to Americanize it, we ought to give the money to the South Vietnamese, let them fight it out." And, then right next to a companion visiting with him, was someone who said, "Absolutely not. Our presence is necessary to stem the Communist invasion."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has expired.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in my home State of Florida, I was unable to be present to vote on rollcall votes 116 and 117, May 15, 1985. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on No. 116, a motion to adjourn, and "aye" on No. 117, approving the rule to consider the Department of Defense authorization bill.●

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, even though Public Law 95-521, the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, requires public financial disclosure, nonetheless, I am continuing my practice, begun in 1963, of reporting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on my personal financial condition. This disclosure, through its more precise statements, differs in important respects from the

report which we are required to file by public law and by House rules.

My report covers the calendar year 1984 and also includes the amount of Federal, State of Wisconsin, and local real estate taxes paid in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, the report follows:

Financial disclosure statement—statement of financial condition, Dec. 31, 1984

Checking account, with the Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives \$3,818.50
Cash 75.91
Securities (stocks, bonds, etc.)
WPCF Credit Union (1 share)..... 5.53

Residential real estate:
Arlington house and lot (1984 assessment)..... 209,400.00
Less mortgage..... 5,105.00

Equity 204,295.00

Sun Prairie house and lot..... 29,000.00
Improvements (dep'd)..... 1,296.00
Back lot 1,200.00
Sewer and water improvements 4,789.00

Total 36,285.00

Less mortgage 11,772.15
Less unpaid sewer and water assessments 246.00

Total 12,018.15

Equity 24,266.85
Household goods and miscellaneous personalty 8,500.00

Miscellaneous assets, deposits, with the U.S. Civil Service retirement fund through Dec. 31, 1984, available only in accordance with applicable laws and regulations 80,879.17
Additional retirement fund deposit 1,130.00

Cash value None

Cash surrender value of life insurance:
On the life of Robert W. Kastenmeier None
On the life of Dorothy C. Kastenmeier 544.00
Deposit, Donaldson Run 400.00
Automobiles:
1976 Oldsmobile 400.00
1978 Mercury 1,600.00
Net worth 243,905.79

Taxes paid in 1984:
Federal income tax 15,717.86
Wisconsin income tax 6,668.97
Federal employers tax 140.79
Arlington County real estate tax 2,031.18

Sun Prairie real estate taxes, including assessments..... 1,743.98
State sales tax 345.00
Total 26,656.78

1984 income congressional salary 72,366.68
Gross rent, Sun Prairie house 3,720.00
Honoraria (4) 6,000.00

Total 82,086.68

1984 separate income of my wife, Dorothy C. Kastenmeier:
Net rent 1,500.00
Hunting lease 160.00

Total 1,660.00

NOTE.—Separate property of spouse not listed.●

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SLAUGHTER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PURSELL, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COELHO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 60 minutes, May 21.

Mr. YATRON, for 60 minutes, May 21.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NELSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BEDELL, and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds 2 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$3,733.75.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SLAUGHTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCCAIN.
Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio in four instances.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. CONTE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COELHO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.
Mr. GORDON.
Ms. KAPTUR.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. LEVINE of California in two instances.

Mr. ADDABBO.
Mr. FASCELL.
Mr. BARNES.
Mr. HUBBARD.
Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.
Mr. MARKEY in two instances.
Mr. GUARINI.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 484. An act to amend the Saccharin Study and Labeling Act;
S. 661. An act entitled the "George Milligan Control Tower"; and
S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 20, 1985, through May 26, 1985, as "National Osteoporosis Awareness Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 20, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various House committees and a delegation traveling under an authorization from the Speaker concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the first quarter of calendar year 1985 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. E. Thomas Coleman	1/4	1/7	Portugal		55,080		324.00				324.00
	1/7	1/9	Belgium		13,714		216.00				216.00
	1/9	1/12	Israel				399.00				399.00
	1/12	1/13	Denmark		1,225		111.00				111.00
	1/13	1/17	Soviet Union				635.00				635.00
	1/17	1/19	Austria		5,140.50		230.00				230.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1985—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Military transportation							5,556.94				5,556.94
Hon. E. Thomas Coleman	3/13	3/15	Switzerland		225.00						225.00
Commercial transportation							921.00				921.00
Hon. James M. Jeffords	1/12	1/14	Argentina		324.00						324.00
	1/15	1/18	Chile		384.00						384.00
Commercial transportation							3,789.00				3,789.00
Hon. Webb Franklin	1/5	1/8	Brazil	1,375.704	434.25						434.25
	1/8	1/12	Peru	2,596.320	432.00						432.00
	1/12	1/16	Argentina	98.064	432.00						432.00
	1/16	1/18	Barbados	796.50	382.00						382.00
Military transportation							5,408.12				5,408.12
Hon. Jerry Huckaby	1/5	1/8	Brazil	1,375.704	434.25						434.25
	1/8	1/12	Peru	2,596.320	432.00						432.00
	1/12	1/16	Argentina	98.064	432.00						432.00
	1/16	1/18	Barbados	796.50	382.00						382.00
Military transportation							5,408.12				5,408.12
Hon. E de la Garza	2/9	2/13	Brazil	1,800.810	495.00						495.00
Codel	2/13	2/17	Argentina	130.464	432.00						432.00
Military transportation							4,068.16				4,068.16
Hon. Berkley Bedell	2/9	2/13	Brazil	1,800.810	495.00						495.00
	2/13	2/17	Argentina	130.464	432.00						432.00
Military transportation							4,068.16				4,068.16
Hon. Charles Hatcher	2/9	2/13	Brazil	1,800.810	495.00						495.00
	2/13	2/17	Argentina	130.464	432.00						432.00
Military transportation							4,068.16				4,068.16
A. Mario Castillo	2/9	2/13	Brazil	1,800.810	495.00						495.00
	2/13	2/17	Argentina	130.464	432.00						432.00
Military transportation							4,068.16				4,068.16
Timothy Galvin	2/9	2/13	Brazil	1,800.810	495.00						495.00
	2/13	2/17	Argentina	130.464	432.00						432.00
Military transportation							4,068.16				4,068.16
Heidi Pender	2/9	2/13	Brazil	1,800.810	495.00						495.00
	2/13	2/17	Argentina	130.464	432.00						432.00
Local air transportation							633.80				633.80
Military transportation							4,068.16				4,068.16
OTHER EXPENDITURES											
Hon. E de la Garza:											
Manaus and Barsilia, Brazil (2/9 to 2/13):											
FSN Embassy support personnel								239.86			239.86
Local transportation								1,564.11			1,564.11
Control rooms								286.54			286.54
Miscellaneous								260.41			260.41
Telephone								53.73			53.73
Buenos Aires, Argentina (2/13 to 2/17):											
FSN Embassy support personnel								1,443.82			1,443.82
Local transportation								210.41			210.41
Interpreting services								455.85			455.85
Representation								100.00			100.00
Miscellaneous								185.71			185.71
Committee total				11,770.50		46,125.94		4,800.44			62,696.88

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

E de la GARZA, Chairman, Apr. 30, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Alfred A. (Al) McCandless	1/4	1/7	Portugal	55,080	324.00						324.00
	1/7	1/9	Belgium	13,714	216.00						216.00
	1/9	1/12	Israel		399.00						399.00
	1/12	1/13	Denmark	1,225	111.00						111.00
	1/13	1/17	Soviet Union		635.00						635.00
	1/17	1/19	Austria	5,140.50	230.00						230.00
U.S. military							5,556.94				5,556.94
Hon. William F. Clinger, Jr	1/4	1/7	Portugal	55,080	324.00		72.92		263.88		660.80
	1/7	1/9	Belgium	13,714	216.00				106.47		322.47
	1/9	1/12	Israel		399.00		207.72		38.16		644.88
	1/12	1/13	Denmark	1,225	111.00		15.48		22.00		148.48
	1/13	1/17	Soviet Union		635.00						635.00
	1/17	1/19	Austria	5,140.50	230.00						230.00
U.S. military							5,556.94				5,556.94
Hon. John Conyers, Jr	1/5	1/7	France	2,308.60	238.00					2,308.60	238.00
	1/7	1/10	Gabon	166,980	345.00						345.00
	1/10	1/11	Cameroon	57,500	119.00				13.91		132.91
	1/11	1/13	Mozambique		216.00						216.00
U.S. military							5,849.25				5,849.25
Commercial							3,827.00				3,827.00
Hon. Cardiss Collins	1/5	1/8	Israel		399.00				566.28		965.28
	1/8	1/11	Egypt		246.00				304.81		550.81
	1/11	1/15	Greece		540.00				80.66		620.66
	1/15	1/18	Spain		327.00				197.51		524.51
U.S. military							8,817.30				8,817.30

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1985—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Glenn English	1/14	1/15	Freeport		156.00						156.00
	1/15	1/17	Panama		160.00						160.00
Hon. Gerald D. Kleczka	1/14	1/15	Freeport		156.00						156.00
	1/15	1/17	Panama		160.00						160.00
William G. Lawrence	1/14	1/15	Freeport		156.00						156.00
	1/15	1/17	Panama		160.00						160.00
Theodore N. Mehl	1/14	1/15	Freeport		156.00						156.00
	1/15	1/17	Panama		160.00						160.00
William T. Cherry	1/14	1/15	Freeport		156.00						156.00
	1/15	1/17	Panama		160.00						160.00
Robert M. Gellman	1/14	1/15	Freeport		156.00						156.00
	1/15	1/17	Panama		160.00						160.00
Transportation for entire delegation							25,338.38				25,338.38
Hon. Mike Synar	2/7	2/8	Mexico	37,916	162.56						162.56
	2/8	2/10	Nicaragua		271.00				* 64.92		395.74
									* 59.82		
	2/10	2/12	Costa Rica		150.00						150.00
	2/12	2/13	El Salvador	607.50	150.00						150.00
Commercial							911.00				911.00
Committee total					8,889.56		56,277.65		1,593.68		66,760.89

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

* Travel allowance.

* Charter change.

JACK BROOKS, Chairman, Apr. 30, 1985.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Garner J. Cline, staff	1/6	1/12	Italy		696.00				1,450.41		2,146.41
	1/12	1/18	Israel		266.00						266.00
	1/18	1/20	England		122.00		109.58				231.58
Commercial transportation							4,723.00				4,723.00
Romano L. Mazzoli, MC	1/7	1/8	England		122.00						122.00
	1/8	1/10	Switzerland		216.00		198.84				414.84
	1/10	1/15	Italy		696.00		508.72				1,204.72
Commercial transportation							4,379.00				4,379.00
Peter Regis, staff	1/7	1/8	England		122.00						122.00
	1/8	1/10	Switzerland		216.00		198.84				414.84
	1/10	1/15	Italy		696.00		508.72				1,204.72
Commercial transportation							4,379.00				4,379.00
Bill McCollum, MC	1/13	1/15	El Salvador		150.00				30.00		180.00
	1/15	1/18	Honduras		288.00						288.00
Commercial transportation							676.00				676.00
Thomas Boyd, staff	1/13	1/15	El Salvador		150.00				30.00		180.00
	1/15	1/18	Honduras		288.00						288.00
Commercial transportation							751.00				751.00
Committee total					4,028.00		16,432.00		1,510.41		21,971.11

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PETER W. RODINO, JR., Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CUBA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 10 AND 18, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Bill Alexander	1/11	1/18	Cuba		690.00		3,120.25				3,810.25
James A.S. Leach	1/11	1/18	Cuba		690.00		3,120.25				3,810.25
Dorothy Thomas	1/11	1/18	Cuba		690.00		3,120.25				3,810.25
Steve Skardon	1/11	1/18	Cuba		690.00		3,120.25				3,810.25

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL ALEXANDER, May 1, 1985.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1298. A letter from the Director, ACTION, transmitting the Agency's 1984 annual report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5407; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1299. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report of political contributions by J. William Middendorf II, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-elect, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1300. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report of

political contributions by Edward J. Perkins, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-elect, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1301. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting the financial audit of the Legion as of December 31, 1983, pursuant to Public Law 88-504, section 3 (36

U.S.C. 1103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1302. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require tonnage measurement of vessels engaged on international voyages and within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1303. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require that Medicare providers of hospital services also participate in the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services [CHAMPUS] and in the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Veterans' Administration [CHAMPVA]; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. H.R. 1460. A bill to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 99-76, Pt. II). Ordered to be printed.

[Omitted from the Record of May 15, 1985]

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1409. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 16, 1985]

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 174. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1460, a bill to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa, and for the purposes (Rept. No. 99-131). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of May 15, 1985]

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1202. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out conservation programs on military reservations and public lands during the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988; with amendments; referred to the Committee on Armed Services for a period ending not later than July 1, 1985, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(c), rule XI (Rept. No. 99-129, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2402. A bill to establish the Public Buildings Service in the General Services Administration, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Government Operations for a period ending not later than June 21, 1985 for con-

sideration of such portions of the bill as fall within that committee's jurisdiction pursuant to clause 1(j) of rule XI (Rept. No. 99-130, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAZZOLI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1452. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend for two years the authorization of appropriations for refugee assistance, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a period ending not later than June 11, 1985 for consideration of such portions of the bill and amendment as fall within that committee's jurisdiction pursuant to clause 1(i), rule XI (Rept. No. 99-132, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 2530. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a one-time amnesty from tax penalties for taxpayers who pay previous underpayments with interest, and to improve compliance with the internal revenue laws by increasing authorizations to the Internal Revenue Service for enforcement and by prohibiting the awarding of Federal contracts and certain Federal licenses to taxpayers who have tax delinquent accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 2531. A bill to encourage the States to prescribe the death penalty for willfully killing a law enforcement officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2532. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against tax for employers who provide onsite dependent care assistance for dependents of their employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 2533. A bill to amend the Maritime Education and Training Act of 1980; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 2534. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act with respect to contributions and expenditures by national banks, corporations, and labor unions; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 2535. A bill to establish a pilot program to develop methods for parents who are in adult literacy programs, and who have preschool-age children who may be educationally at risk, to acquire the skills necessary to work in the home with those children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUCKABY (for himself and Mr. STANGELAND):

H.R. 2536. A bill to provide price and income protection for farmers of cotton, rice, and sugar, and to assure consumers an abundance of such commodities at reasonable prices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself and Mr. LIVINGSTON):

H.R. 2537. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of

Transportation to apportion Federal highway funds withheld from any State for failure to have in effect a minimum drinking age of 21 if certain alcohol-related traffic fatalities are significantly reduced; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LEACH of Iowa (for himself and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 2538. A bill exempting the export of certain agricultural commodities from the cargo preference provision of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 2540. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN (for himself, Mr. WISE, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 2541. A bill to amend the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 to provide that extended benefits will be payable in any State in which the rate of regular unemployment equals or exceeds 9 per centum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONSON (for himself, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 2542. A bill designating the building located at 125 South State Street, Salt Lake City, UT, as the "Wallace F. Bennett Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. COBEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. COURTER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SILJANDER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MAVEROULES, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

H.R. 2543. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare payment for therapeutic shoes for individuals with severe diabetic foot disease; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 2544. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a clearinghouse for information relating to criminal practices in connection with certain employment of youth, to require active Federal investigation and prosecution of such practices in violation of Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H. Con. Res. 149. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should extend full diplomatic recognition to the African National Congress in South Africa and should provide it with economic support in its struggle against apartheid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON (for himself, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. O'BRIEN,

Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LENT, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DE LA

GARZA, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DYSON, Mr. HENDON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HILER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. LOEF-FLER, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. RUDD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LATTI, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. DAUB, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MICA, Mr. DELAY, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. EMERSON):

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the national security policy of the United States should reflect a national strategy of peace through strength; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PURSELL (for himself, Mr. TAUKE, and Ms. SNOWE):

H. Con. Res. 151. Concurrent resolution to revise the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985 and setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Res. 175. Resolution to provide that it shall not be in order to consider any legislation relating to the sale of the interest of the United States in the common stock of the Consolidated Rail Corporation to the Norfolk Southern Corp., until the Department of Justice has taken certain actions and reported to the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 176. Resolution establishing a pilot program of fellowships under the House of Representatives for persons who are blind or deaf; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Maria Marino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Willie G. Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 44: Mr. FAUNTROY.
H.R. 151: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. EDGAR, and Ms. OKAR.
H.R. 281: Mr. TRAXLER.
H.R. 343: Mr. STANGELAND.
H.R. 641: Mr. SHELBY.
H.R. 776: Mr. SHAW and Mr. BLAZ.
H.R. 877: Mr. FRANKLIN.
H.R. 893: Mr. FEIGHAN.
H.R. 915: Mr. SKELTON.
H.R. 1059: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1123: Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. SUND-QUIST, and Mr. MARLENEE.

H.R. 1132: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1161: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1217: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1318: Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 1427: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SEIBERLING, Ms. OKAR, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1550: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1611: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. NOWAK, and Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

H.R. 1616: Mr. PERKINS.

H.R. 1675: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1715: Mr. BATES, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1719: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GROTEBERG, and Mr. LEATH of Texas.

H.R. 1724: Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 1853: Mr. SISISKY and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 1888: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HILER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. GREGG, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. SHARP.

H.R. 1916: Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SILJANDER.

H.R. 1965: Mrs. BYRON, Mr. LATTI, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 2003: Mr. KOLTER and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 2010: Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2020: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. YATES, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2034: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. BURTON of California, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2042: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2119: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MONSON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DAUB, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 2184: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 2262: Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2263: Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. DIOGUARDI, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2293: Mr. WILSON, Mr. LUKE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WAGREN, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 2337: Mr. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2364: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2397: Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. OLIN, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 2401: Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2489: Mr. LUKE and Mr. SWIFT.

H.J. Res. 3: Mrs. JOHNSON.

H.J. Res. 24: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.J. Res. 131: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RAY, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

H.J. Res. 156: Mr. MANTON.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. LOTT, Mr. WIRTH, Mr.

MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. HOYER.

H.J. Res. 230: Mr. TALLON, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.J. Res. 234: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ROE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SOLARZ, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.J. Res. 263: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. EARLY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Ms. OKAR, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ROE, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GALLO, Ms. FIEDLER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GREEN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. COURTER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. VENTO.

H.J. Res. 267: Mr. HUCKABY and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. BROYHILL.

H. Con. Res. 117: Mrs. LLOYD and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H. Res. 37: Mr. MURPHY.

H. Res. 55: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. GUARINI.

H. Res. 165: Mr. PRICE, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. SCHUETTE, Ms. OKAR, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. FOWLER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MICA, and Mr. ANDERSON.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1460

By Mr. DELLUMS:

(Amendment in the nature of a substitute.)

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON INVESTMENTS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

No United States person may, directly or through another person, make or hold any investment in South Africa.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON EXPORTS TO SOUTH AFRICA.

(1) GENERAL RULE.—No goods, technology, or other information subject to the jurisdiction of the United States may be exported to South Africa, and no goods, technology, or other information may be exported to South Africa by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The prohibition contained in this paragraph shall apply to goods, technology, or other information of any kind, which is subject to controls under the Export Administration Act of 1979, the Arms Export Control Act, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, or any other provision of law.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition contained in paragraph (1) shall not apply to exports described in section 6(f) of the Export Administration Act of 1979.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON LANDING RIGHTS OF SOUTH AFRICAN AIRCRAFT.

(a) **PROHIBITION.**—The Secretary of Transportation shall prohibit the takeoff and landing of any aircraft by an air carrier owned by the Government of South Africa or any citizen or national of South Africa.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS FOR EMERGENCIES.**—The Secretary of Transportation may provide for such exceptions from the prohibition set forth in subsection (a) as the Secretary considers necessary to provide for emergencies in which the safety of an aircraft or its crew or passengers are threatened.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the terms "aircraft" and "air carrier" have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON IMPORTATION OF KRUGERRANDS.

No person may import into the United States any South African krugerrand or any other gold coin minted in South Africa or offered for sale by the Government of South Africa.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT; PENALTIES.

(a) **AUTHORITIES OF THE PRESIDENT.**—The President shall take necessary steps to insure compliance with the provisions of this Act and any regulations, licenses, and orders issued to carry out this Act, including establishing mechanisms to monitor compliance with such provisions, regulations, licenses, and orders. In insuring such compliance, the President may conduct investigations, hold hearings, administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, take depositions, and require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and production of all books, papers, and documents relating to any matter under investigation.

(b) **VIOLATIONS.**—Any person that violates the provisions of this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this Act shall—

(1) if other than an individual, be fined not more than \$1,000,000; and

(2) if an individual, be fined not more than \$50,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) ADDITIONAL PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Whenever a person violates the provisions of this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued under this Act—

(A) any officer, director, or employee of such person, or any natural person in control of such person who knowingly and willfully ordered, authorized, acquiesced in, or carried out the act or practice constituting the violation, and

(B) any agent of such person who knowingly and willfully carried out such act or practice, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(2) **RESTRICTION OF PAYMENT OF FINES.**—A fine imposed under paragraph (1) on an individual for an act or practice constituting a violation may not be paid, directly or indirectly, by the person committing the violation itself.

(d) **SEIZURE AND FORFEITURE OF AIRCRAFT.**—Any aircraft used in connection with a violation of section 3 of this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out that section shall be subject to seizure by and forfeiture to the United States. All provisions of law relating to the seizure, forfeiture, and condemnation of articles for violations of the customs laws, the disposition of articles or the proceeds from the sale there-

of, and the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures shall apply to the seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this subsection, insofar as such provisions of law are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act; except that all powers, rights, and duties conferred or imposed by the customs laws upon any officer or employee of the Department of the Treasury shall, for purposes of this subsection, be exercised or performed by the Secretary of Transportation or by such persons as the Secretary may designate.

SEC. 6. REGULATIONS.

The President may issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) **UNITED STATES.**—The term "United States" includes the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(2) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term "United States person" means any United States resident or national and any domestic concern (including any permanent domestic establishment of any foreign concern).

(3) **SOUTH AFRICA.**—The term "South Africa" includes the Republic of South Africa; any territory under the administration, legal or illegal, of South Africa; and the "bantustans" or "homelands", to which South African blacks are assigned on the basis of ethnic origin, including the Tanskel, Bophuthastswana, Venda, and Ciskei.

(4) **INVESTMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA.**—A person makes or holds an investment in South Africa if that person—

(A) establishes or contributes funds or other resources (including making a loan or other extension of credit) for the establishment of a business enterprise in South Africa;

(B) otherwise invests funds in a business enterprise in South Africa, including—

(i) beneficially owning or controlling a share or interest in such a business enterprise;

(ii) beneficially owning or controlling a bond or other debt instrument issued by such a business enterprise;

(iii) making capital contributions in money or kind to such a business enterprise; and

(iv) making a loan or other extension of credit to such a business enterprise, or giving security for the debts of such a business enterprise; or

(C) controls a business enterprise in South Africa, in cases to which subparagraphs (A) and (B) do not apply.

(5) **FUNDS.**—The term "funds" means money or other resources.

(6) **BUSINESS ENTERPRISE.**—The term "business enterprise" means any organization, association, branch, or venture which exists for profitmaking purposes or to otherwise secure economic advantage; and such term includes the ownership of real estate.

(7) **BRANCH.**—The term "branch" means the operations or activities conducted by a person in a different location in its own name rather than through an incorporated entity.

(8) **CONTROL.**—A United States person shall be presumed to control a business enterprise in South Africa if—

(A) the business enterprise is operated by the United States person pursuant to the provisions of an exclusive management contract;

(B) a majority of the members of the board of directors of the business enterprise are also members of the comparable governing body of the United States person;

(C) the United States person has authority to appoint a majority of the members of the board of directors of the business enterprise; or

(D) the United States person has authority to appoint the chief operating officer of the business enterprise.

SEC. 8. APPLICABILITY TO EVASIONS OF ACT.

This Act shall apply to any United States person who undertakes or causes to be undertaken any transaction or activity with the intent to evade the provisions of this Act or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this Act.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this Act shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. GUNDERSON:

(Amendment in the nature of a substitute.)

—Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

SECTION 1. The Congress finds and declares that—

(a) the policy and practice of apartheid—

(1) deliberately separates millions of South African "migrant" workers from their families;

(2) denies meaningful, democratic participation in the political process to the majority of the South African population;

(3) consigns the mass of South African citizenry to lives of economic and educational deprivation;

(4) denies black citizens of South Africa the right to travel freely within their own country;

(5) leads to the arbitrary government confiscation of the private property legally owned by black South African nationals;

(6) tries to deprive many South African citizens of South African citizenship;

(b) the policy and practice of apartheid is repugnant to the moral and political values of democratic and free societies, and runs counter to United States policies to promote democratic governments throughout the world and respect for human rights; and

(c) it is the policy of the United States to promote peaceful change in South Africa through diplomatic means, but also, where necessary and appropriate, through the adoption of other measures, in conjunction with our allies, in order to reinforce United States opposition to apartheid.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "national of the United States" means—

(A) a natural person who is a citizen of the United States or who owes permanent allegiance to the United States; or

(B) a corporation, partnership, or other enterprise if—

(i) natural persons who are nationals of the United States own or control, directly or indirectly, more than 50 per centum of the outstanding voting securities;

(ii) natural persons who are nationals of the United States own or control, directly or indirectly 25 per centum or more of the voting securities, and natural persons of another nationality do not own or control as equal or larger percentage;

(iii) any natural person who is a national of the United States operates the corporation, partnership, or enterprise pursuant to the provisions of an exclusive management contract;

(iv) a majority of the members of the board of directors are also members of the comparable governing body of corporation or legal entity organized under the laws of the United States, any State or territory thereof, or the District of Columbia;

(v) natural persons who are nationals of the United States have authority to appoint the chief operating officer; and

(2) the term "South Africa" refers to the territory that constituted the Republic of South Africa on May 31, 1961.

SCHOLARSHIP FOR BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS

Sec. 3. Section 105(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1) after (b)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) Beginning with the fiscal year 1986, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$15,000,000 of assistance provided under this section by the Administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering this part of this Act shall be used to finance scholarships for black South Africans who are attending universities, colleges, and secondary schools in South Africa and who are selected in accordance with subparagraph (B). Of the funds available under the preceding sentence to carry out this subparagraph, not less than \$5,000,000 shall be available only for assistance to full-time teachers or other educational professionals pursuing studies toward the improvement of their professional credentials.

"(B) Individuals for whom scholarships are financed under subparagraph (A) shall be selected by a national panel or by regional panels composed solely of members of the teaching profession appointed by the United States chief of diplomatic mission to South Africa. No such individual may be selected through any contract entered into with the agency primarily responsible for administering this part of this Act."

HUMAN RIGHTS FUND

Sec. 4. Section 116(e)(2)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out "1984 and" and inserting in lieu thereof "1984";

(2) by inserting after "1985" a comma and the following: "and \$1,500,000 for the fiscal year 1986, and for each fiscal year thereafter"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following: "Grants under this paragraph shall be made by the Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs."

EXPANDING PARTICIPATION IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN ECONOMY

Sec. 5. (a) The Congress declares—

(1) that the denial under the apartheid laws of South Africa of the rights of South African blacks and other nonwhites to have the opportunity to participate equitably in the South African economy as managers or owners of, or professionals in, business enterprises, and

(2) the policy of confining South African blacks and other nonwhites to the status of employees in minority-dominated businesses is an affront to the values of a free society.

(b) The Congress hereby—

(1) applauds the commitment of nationals of the United States adhering to the principles set forth in section 10 to assure that South African blacks and other nonwhites are given assistance in gaining their rightful place in the South African economy; and

(2) urges the United States Government to assist in all appropriate ways the realization by South African blacks and other nonwhites of their rightful place in the South African economy.

(c) The Secretary of State and any other head of a department or agency of the United States carrying out activities in South Africa shall, to the maximum extent practicable, in procuring goods or services, make affirmative efforts to assist business enterprises having more than 50 per centum beneficial ownership by South African blacks or other nonwhite South Africans.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Sec. 6. Section 237(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a) Insurance" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), insurance"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Insurance, reinsurance, and guaranties of loans may be issued to cover an investment made in connection with a project in South Africa, notwithstanding the absence of an agreement with the Government of South Africa, if such investment is otherwise eligible under this title, except that—

"(A) the issuance of any such insurance, reinsurance, or guaranty shall only be made to promote joint ventures between business enterprises controlled or owned by South African blacks or other nonwhite South Africans and business enterprises controlled or owned by United States nationals; and

"(B) the national of the United States holds a minority interest or agrees to relinquish its majority interest during the course of the joint venture."

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 7. Section 2(b)(9) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 is amended—

(1) by striking out "(9) In" and inserting in lieu thereof "(9)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), in"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) The Bank shall take active steps to encourage the use of its facilities to guarantee, insure, extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit to business enterprises in South Africa that are majority owned by South African blacks or other nonwhite South Africans. The certification requirement contained in clause (C) of subparagraphs (A) shall not apply to exports to or purchases from business enterprises which are majority owned by South African blacks or other nonwhite South Africans."

LABOR PRACTICES OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Sec. 8. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that the labor practices used by the United States Government—

(1) for the direct hire of South Africans, (2) for the reimbursement out of official residence funds of South Africans and employees of South African organizations for their employment services on behalf of the United States Government, and

(3) for the employment services of South Africans arranged by contract, should represent the best of American labor practices and should serve as a model for the labor practices of nationals of the United States in South Africa.

(b) Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of State and any other head of a department or agency of the United States carrying out activities in South Africa shall promptly take the necessary steps to ensure

that the labor practices applied to the employment services described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (a) are governed by the principles set forth in section 10.

EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES OF UNITED STATES NATIONALS IN SOUTH AFRICA

SEC. 9. (a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that any national of the United States who—

(1) has a branch or office in South Africa, or

(2) controls a business enterprise in South Africa, should implement, in the operation of such branch, office, or business enterprise, those principles relating to employment practices set forth in section 10.

(b) SANCTIONS.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—The sanctions set forth in paragraph (2) shall apply to any national of the United States who—

(A) has a branch or office in South Africa, or

(B) controls a business enterprise in South Africa,

in which more than 20 people are employed, and who does not implement the principles set forth in section 202 in the operation of that business enterprise.

(2) SANCTIONS.—With respect to any national of the United States described in paragraph (1)—

(A) no department or agency of the United States may—

(i) enter into any contract with,

(ii) make any loan, issue any guaranty of a loan, or issue any insurance to,

(iii) provide any counseling on economic or political risks to, or

(iv) intercede with any foreign government or any national regarding the foreign investment or export marketing activities in any country of,

that national; and

(B) that national may not receive any credit or deduction under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any income, war profits, or excess profits paid or accrued to South Africa.

(c) No department or agency of the United States may intercede with any foreign government or any national regarding the export marketing activities in any country of any national of the United States employing more than twenty persons in South Africa that is not implementing the principles relating to employment practices in South Africa set forth in section 10. No such national may make any new investment in the Republic of South Africa. The Secretary of State shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement this section.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Sec. 10. (a) The principles referred to in sections 8 and 9 of this Act are as follows:

(1) Desegregating the races in each employment facility, including—

(A) removing all race designation signs;

(B) desegregating all eating, rest, and work facilities; and

(C) terminating all regulations which are based on racial discrimination.

(2) Providing equal employment for all employees, including—

(A) assuring that any health, accident, or death benefit plans that are established are nondiscriminatory and open to all employees, on an equitable basis; and

(B) implementing equal and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions of employment for all employees, and abolishing job reservations, job fragmentation, apprenticeship

restrictions for blacks and other nonwhites, and differential employment criteria, which discriminate on the basis of race or ethnic origin.

(3) Establishing equally pay for all employees doing equal work, including—

(A) establishing and implementing, as soon as possible, a wage and salary structure which is applied equal to all employees, regardless of race, who are engaged in equal work;

(B) reviewing the distinction between hourly and salaried job classifications, and establishing and implementing an equitable and unified system of job classifications which takes into account such review; and

(C) eliminating inequities in seniority and in-grade benefits so that all employees, regardless of race, who perform similar jobs are eligible for the same seniority and in-grade benefits.

(4) Establishing a minimum wage and salary structure based on a cost-of-living index which takes into account the needs of employees and their families.

(5) Increasing, by appropriate means, the number of blacks and other nonwhites in managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs for the purpose of significantly increasing the representation of blacks and other nonwhites in such jobs, including—

(A) developing training programs that will prepare substantial numbers of blacks and other nonwhites for such jobs as soon as possible, including—

(i) creating on-the-job training programs and facilities to assist employees to advance to higher paying jobs requiring greater skills;

(B) establishing procedures to assess, identify, and actively recruit employees with potential for further advancement;

(C) identifying blacks and other nonwhites with high management potential and enrolling them in accelerated management programs;

(D) establishing and expanding programs to enable employees to further their education and skills at recognized education facilities; and

(E) establishing timetables to carry out this paragraph.

(6) Taking reasonable steps to improve the quality of employees' lives outside the work environment with respect to housing, transportation, schooling, recreation, and health, including—

(A) providing assistance to black and other nonwhite employees for housing, health care, transportation, and recreation either through the provision of facilities or services or providing financial assistance to employees for such purposes, including the expansion or creation of in-house medical facilities or other medical programs to improve medical care for black and other nonwhite employees and their dependents; and

(B) participating in the development of programs that address the education needs of employees, their dependents, and the local community.

(7) Recognizing labor unions and implementing fair labor practices, including—

(A) recognizing the right of all employees, regardless of racial or other distinctions, to self-organization and to form, join, or assist labor organizations, freely and without penalty or reprisal, and recognizing the right to refrain from any such activity;

(B) refraining from—

(i) interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of their rights of self-organization under this paragraph,

(ii) dominating or interfering with the formation or administration of any labor organization or sponsoring, controlling, or contributing financial or other assistance to it,

(iii) encouraging or discouraging membership in any labor organization by discrimination in regard to hiring, tenure, promotion, or other condition of employment,

(iv) discharging or otherwise disciplining or discriminating against any employee who has exercised any rights of self-organization under this paragraph, and

(C) allowing employees to exercise rights of self-organization, including solicitation of fellow employees during nonworking hours, allowing distribution and posting of union literature by employees during nonworking hours in nonworking areas, and allowing reasonable access to labor organization representatives to communicate with employees on employer premises at reasonable times;

(D) allowing employee representatives to meet with employer representatives during working hours without loss of pay for purposes of collective bargaining, negotiation of agreements, and representation of employee grievances;

(E) regularly informing employees that it is company policy to consult and bargain collectively with organizations which are freely elected by the employees to represent them; and

(F) utilizing impartial persons mutually agreed upon by employer and employee representatives to resolve disputes concerning election of representatives, negotiation of agreements or grievances arising thereunder, or any other matters arising under this paragraph.

(b) The Secretary of State may issue guidelines and criteria to assist persons who are or may be subject to this section in complying with the principles set forth in subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary may, upon request, give an advisory opinion to any person who is or may be subject to this section as to whether that person is subject to this section or would be considered to be in compliance with the principles set forth in subsection (a).

(c) The Secretary of State may promulgate such regulations as the Secretary may deem necessary to implement the provisions of this Act. The Secretary may conduct investigations, hold hearings, administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, take dispositions, and require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers, and documents relating to any matter under investigation. The Secretary may require all persons referred to in subsection (a) to register with the Department of State.

(d) Any person who willfully violates any rule or regulation issued under this section or who willfully, in a registration statement or report required by the Secretary, makes any untrue statement of a material fact or omits to state a material fact required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not misleading, shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

(e) In carrying out functions under this section, the President is authorized to exercise the same powers concerning violations and enforcement which are conferred upon departments, agencies and officials by subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 11 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, and by subsections (a) and (c) of section 12 of such Act, subject to the same terms and

conditions as are applicable to such powers under such Act. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed as authorizing the withholding of information from the Congress.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may enter into contacts with one or more private organizations or individuals to assist the Secretary on implementing this section.

POLICY ON ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

SEC. 11. (a) It shall be the policy of the United States to impose economic sanctions against the Government of South Africa if, within two years of the date of enactment of this section, significant progress has not been made toward ending the policy of apartheid.

(b) The President may waive sanctions contained in subsection (a) of this section for a period of not more than 12 months if—

(1) the President determines that one or more of the conditions as set forth in subsection (d) of this section are met,

(2) the President submits that determination to the Congress, and

(3) a joint resolution is enacted approving the President's determination.

(c) The President may waive the sanctions contained in subsection (a) of this section for an additional 6-month period if, before each such waiver—

(1) the President determines that an additional condition set forth in subsection (d) has been met since the preceding waiver under this subsection became effective,

(2) the President submits that determination to the Congress, and

(3) a joint resolution is enacted approving the President's determination.

(d) STATEMENT OF CONDITIONS.—The conditions referred to in subsections (b) and (c) are the following:

(1) FAMILY HOUSING NEAR PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT.—The Government of South Africa has eliminated the system which makes it impossible for black employees and their families to be housed in family accommodations near the place of employment.

(2) RIGHT TO SEEK EMPLOYMENT.—The Government of South Africa has eliminated all policies that restrict the rights of black people to seek employment in South Africa and to live wherever they find employment in South Africa.

(3) ELIMINATING DENATIONALIZATION.—The Government of South Africa has eliminated all policies that make distinctions between the South African nationality of blacks and whites.

(4) ELIMINATING REMOVALS.—The Government of South Africa has eliminated removals of black populations from certain geographic areas on account of race or ethnic origin.

(5) ELIMINATING RESIDENCE RESTRICTIONS.—The Government of South Africa has eliminated all residence restrictions based on race or ethnic origin.

(6) NEGOTIATIONS FOR NEW POLITICAL SYSTEM.—The Government of South Africa has entered into meaningful negotiations with truly representative leaders of the black population for a new political system providing for the full national participation of all the people of South Africa in the social, political, and economic life in that country and an end to discrimination based on race or ethnic origin.

(7) SETTLEMENT OF NAMIBIA.—An internationally recognized settlement for Namibia has been achieved.

(8) **FREEDING POLITICAL PRISONERS.**—The Government of South Africa has freed all political prisoners.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 12. (a) The President shall prepare and transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate March 1, 1987 and every six months thereafter, a report on the extent to which significant progress has been made toward ending the system of apartheid, including—

(1) a detailed assessment of the extent to which the Government of South Africa has made progress in—

(A) housing black workers with their families;

(B) abolishing the pass laws which prevent blacks from moving freely into the cities;

(C) terminating the migrant labor system;

(D) allowing unrestricted labor union rights for all; and

(E) increasing local investment in black education and training;

(2) a statement of any conclusions drawn by the Inter-Allied Working Group on South Africa;

(3) a determination by the President as to whether significant progress has been made in achieving the purposes described in clauses (A) through (E) of paragraph (1); and

(4) if the President determines under paragraph (3) that significant progress has not been made, a recommendation as to which of the following sanctions should be imposed:

(A) A ban on new commercial investment in South Africa.

(B) A ban on new bank loans to the Government of South Africa.

(C) A ban on the importation of South African Krugerrands.

(D) A ban on the sale of computers to the central Government of South Africa.

TITLE II—UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON SOUTH AFRICA

SEC. 201. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established a commission to be known as the "United States Commission on South Africa" (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 202. DUTIES OF COMMISSION.

(a) **STUDY AND REPORT ON PROGRESS AGAINST APARTHEID.**—The Commission shall conduct an ongoing study of, and shall report to the Congress on, the progress that the Government of South Africa has made—

(1) in eliminating the system of apartheid; and

(2) toward the full participation of blacks and other nonwhites in the social, political, and economic life in South Africa.

The Commission shall also study the economic and political relations between the United States and South Africa.

(b) **FOCUS OF STUDY.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) with respect to the progress toward eliminating apartheid, pay particular attention to the termination of—

(A) the Group Areas Act;

(B) the Pass Laws;

(C) the Influx Control Act;

(D) the Mixed Marriages Act;

(E) the Immorality Act;

(F) the homelands policy; and

(G) the detention of persons without due process of law; and

(2) with respect to the goals referred to in subsection (a)(2), pay particular attention to

the involvement of recognized representatives of the black and nonwhite population in South Africa in achieving these goals, including the convening, as soon as possible, by the Government of South Africa of a national congress, composed of all pro-democratic groups in South Africa, to establish a timetable for granting full citizenship to blacks and other nonwhites in South Africa.

(c) **SCHEDULE OF STUDY AND REPORTS.**

(1) **STUDY.**—The Commission shall conduct the study under subsection (a) during the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **REPORTS.**—The Commission shall submit in interim reports to the Congress at the end of each 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act. Not later than the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit a final report to the Congress. The final report shall contain—

(A) a determination by the Commission of whether the Government of South Africa has made substantial progress toward the goals set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), and

(B) if the Commission determines under subparagraph (A) that substantial progress has not been made, a recommendation as to which of the following should be imposed:

(i) A ban on new commercial investment in South Africa.

(ii) A ban on new bank loans to the Government of South Africa.

(iii) A ban of the sale of computers to the Government of South Africa.

(iv) Changes in diplomatic relations with South Africa.

SEC. 203. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) **NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.**

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall be composed of 15 members, as follows:

(A) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(B) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(C) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(D) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(E) Seven members appointed by the President from among persons knowledgeable in South African affairs, as follows:

(i) One member shall be an officer of the Department of State.

(ii) One member shall be an officer of the Department of Commerce.

(iii) One member shall be an officer of the Department of the Treasury.

(iv) Four members shall be appointed from among persons who are not officers or employees of any government who are specially qualified to serve on the Commission by virtue of their education, training, or experience.

(2) **DESIGNATION OF SUBSTITUTES.**—If any member referred to in paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B) is the same individual as a member referred to in paragraph (1)(C) or (1)(D), then the individual shall designate another member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or Foreign Relations, as the case may be, to serve as a member of the Commission.

(3) **FILLING OF VACANCIES.**—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) **CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP.**—If any member of the Commission who was appointed to the Commission as a Member of the Congress leaves that office, or if any member of the Commission who was appointed from persons who are not officers or employees of any government becomes an officer or employee of a government, he or she may continue as a member of the Commission for not longer than the 60-day period beginning on the date he or she leaves that office or becomes such an officer or employee, as the case may be.

(c) **TERMS.**—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(d) **BASIC PAY.**

(1) **FOR NON-GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Commission shall serve without pay, but shall be allowed travel or transportation expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, to the same extent as employees serving intermittently in the Government Service are allowed such expenses under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.**—Members of the Commission who are full-time officers or employees of the United States or Members of the Congress shall receive no additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Commission.

(e) **QUORUM.**—Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(f) **CHAIRMAN.**—The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

(g) **MEETINGS.**—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members.

SEC. 204. STAFF OF COMMISSION; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) **STAFF.**—The Commission may appoint and fix the pay of such additional personnel as it considers appropriate.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.**—The staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapters III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no individual so appointed may receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule.

(c) **EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.**—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3209(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule.

(d) **STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act.

SEC. 205. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) **HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.**—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this title, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(b) **POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.**—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if so authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(c) **OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.**—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon the request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(d) **GIFTS.**—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(e) **MAILS.**—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(f) **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.**—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(g) **SUBPOENA POWER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.

(2) **REFUSAL TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.**—If a person issued a subpoena under paragraph (1) refuses to obey such subpoena or is guilty of contempt, any court of the United States within the judicial district within which the hearing is conducted or within the judicial district within which such person is found or resides or transacts business may (upon application by the Commission) order such person to appear before the Commission to produce evidence or to give testimony relating to the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(3) **SERVING OF SUBPOENAS.**—The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(4) **VENUE OF PROCESS.**—All process of any court to which application may be made under this section may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(h) **IMMUNITY.**—No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpoena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture by reason of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which such individual is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

SEC. 206. **Termination.**

The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submitting its final report pursuant to section 412(c).

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

—Page , after line , insert the following new section:

SEC. 15. **BAN ON IMPORTING URANIUM AND COAL FROM SOUTH AFRICA AND NAMIBIA.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as otherwise provided in this Act, the following products of South Africa and Namibia may not be imported into the United States: coal and uranium ore.

Page 5, line 2, strike out "sections 4 and 5" and insert in lieu thereof "section 4, 5, and 15"; and line 12, strike out "sections 4 and 5" and insert in lieu thereof "sections 4, 5, 15".

Page 12, line 25, strike out "and".

Page 13, line 1, insert ", and on importing coal and uranium ore from South Africa" immediately before the period.

By Mr. SILJANDER:

(Amendment in the nature of a substitute.)

—Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. **SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "South Africa Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. **DECLARATION OF POLICY AND STATEMENT OF FINDING.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to be a positive influence in bringing an end to the apartheid system of racial discrimination in South Africa.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that the policy and practice of apartheid—

(1) separates millions of workers from their families;

(2) is based on a form of rule in South Africa by a minority only, which denies political rights to the majority;

(3) consigns the masses of people living under it to lives of poverty;

(4) denies nonwhite nationals of South Africa the right to travel freely within their own country;

(5) provides economic privileges for some by denying basic freedoms for others;

(6) results in forceable removals of peoples from their homes against their wills;

(7) denies the majority of the people of South Africa their basic human rights;

(8) has damaged the status and reputation of the Republic of South Africa as a civilized nation; and

(9) has contributed significantly to a general climate of instability throughout southern Africa.

(c) **DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.**—The Congress makes the following declarations:

(1) The policy and practice of apartheid runs counter to the principles of civilized nations and debases human dignity, and is repugnant to the values of the United States of America. The Congress consequently reaffirms that it is the continuing policy of the United States Government to oppose the practice of apartheid by the Government of South Africa, especially through diplomatic means, and, when necessary and appropriate, through the enactment and implementation of laws intended to reinforce United States policy with respect to apartheid.

(2) It is the policy of the United States to promote change in South Africa through peaceful means. The Congress directs the Secretary of State to consider urgently the best possible means to use United States influence to bring an end to this morally repugnant practice in a nonviolent manner, recognizing that this objective will best be achieved through cooperative action on the part of all nations and through the exercise

of political rights by all of the people of South Africa.

(3) The Congress recognizes that the objectives of peaceful change in South Africa and the exercise of political rights by all people in that country can be served if United States influence is directed toward building institutions that will enable the South African people to challenge the inequities of the apartheid system. To this end, the Congress declares it is the policy of the United States to support an independent and impartial judicial system in South Africa. The Congress declares further that it is the policy of the United States to support free trade unions for South African workers and to encourage the full participation of all the people of South Africa in the social, political, and economic life in that country.

(4) The Congress recognizes that the objectives of peaceful change in South Africa cannot be achieved unless representatives of all segments of the population in South Africa are convened for the purpose of making the necessary changes to establish a fully representative democratic system.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON SOUTH AFRICA

SEC. 101. **ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.**

There is established a commission to be known as the "United States Commission on South Africa" (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 102. **DUTIES OF COMMISSION.**

(a) **STUDY AND REPORT ON PROGRESS AGAINST APARTHEID.**—The Commission shall conduct an ongoing study of, and shall report to the Congress on, the progress that the Government of South Africa has made—

(1) in eliminating the system of apartheid; and

(2) toward the full participation of blacks and other nonwhites in the social, political, and economic life in South Africa.

The Commission shall also study the economic and political relations between the United States and South Africa.

(b) **FOCUS OF STUDY.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(1) with respect to the progress toward eliminating apartheid, pay particular attention to the termination of—

(A) the Group Areas Act;

(B) the Pass Laws;

(C) the Influx Control Act;

(D) the Mixed Marriages Act;

(E) the Immorality Act;

(F) the homelands policy; and

(G) the detention of persons without due process of law; and

(2) with respect to the goals referred to in subsection (a)(2), pay particular attention to the involvement of recognized representatives of the black and nonwhite population in South Africa in achieving these goals, including the convening, as soon as possible, by the Government of South Africa of a national congress, composed of all pro-democratic groups in South Africa, to establish a timetable for granting full citizenship to blacks and other nonwhites in South Africa.

(c) **SCHEDULE OF STUDY AND REPORTS.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—The Commission shall conduct the study under subsection (a) during the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) **REPORTS.**—The Commission shall submit interim reports to the Congress at the end of each 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Not later than the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit a final report to the Congress. The final report shall contain—

(A) a determination by the Commission of whether the Government of South Africa has made substantial progress toward the goals set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), and

(B) if the Commission determines under subparagraph (A) that substantial progress has not been made, a recommendation as to which of the following should be imposed:

(i) A ban on new commercial investment in South Africa.

(ii) A ban on new bank loans to the Government of South Africa.

(iii) A ban of the sale of computers to the Government of South Africa.

(iv) Changes in diplomatic relations with South Africa.

SEC. 103. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 15 members, as follows:

(A) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(B) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(C) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(D) The chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(E) Seven members appointed by the President from among persons knowledgeable in South African affairs, as follows:

(i) One member shall be an officer of the Department of State.

(ii) One member shall be an officer of the Department of Commerce.

(iii) One member shall be an officer of the Department of the Treasury.

(vi) Four members shall be appointed from among persons who are not officers or employees of any government who are specially qualified to serve on the Commission by virtue of their education, training, or experience.

(2) DESIGNATION OF SUBSTITUTES.—If any member referred to in paragraph (1)(A) or (1)(B) is the same individual as a member referred to in paragraph (1)(C) or (1)(D), then the individual shall designate another member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or Foreign Relations, as the case may be, to serve as a member of the Commission.

(3) FILLING OF VACANCIES.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP.—If any member of the Commission who was appointed to the Commission as a Member of the Congress leaves that office, or if any member of the Commission who was appointed from persons who are not officers or employees of any government becomes an officer or employee of a government, he or she may continue as a member of the Commission for not longer than the 60-day period beginning on the date he or she leaves that office or becomes such an officer or employee, as the case may be.

(c) TERMS.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(d) BASIC PAY.—

(1) FOR NON-GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), mem-

bers of the Commission shall serve without pay, but shall be allowed travel or transportation expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, to the same extent as employees serving intermittently in the Government Service are allowed such expenses under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Members of the Commission who are full-time officers or employees of the United States or Members of the Congress shall receive no additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Commission.

(e) QUORUM.—Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

(f) CHAIRMAN.—The Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

(g) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members.

SEC. 104. STAFF OF COMMISSION; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) STAFF.—The Commission may appoint and fix the pay of such additional personnel as it considers appropriate.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN CIVIL SERVICE LAWS.—The staff of the Commission may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no individual so appointed may receive pay in excess of the annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the daily equivalent of the minimum annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-18 of the General Schedule.

(d) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out its duties under this Act.

SEC. 105. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out this title, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Commission considers appropriate. The Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

(b) POWERS OF MEMBERS AND AGENTS.—Any member or agent of the Commission may, if so authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(c) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon the request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(d) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(e) MAILS.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and

under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(f) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(g) SUBPOENA POWER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing within the United States.

(2) REFUSAL TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.—If a person issued a subpoena under paragraph (1) refuses to obey such subpoena or is guilty of contempt, any court of the United States within the judicial district within which the hearing is conducted or within the judicial district within which such person is found or resides or transacts business may (upon application by the Commission) order such person to appear before the Commission to produce evidence or to give testimony relating to the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(3) SERVING OF SUBPOENAS.—The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(4) VENUE OF PROCESS.—All process of any court to which application may be made under this section may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(h) IMMUNITY.—No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpoena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture by reason of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which such individual is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

SEC. 106. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submitting its final report pursuant to section 412(c).

TITLE II—FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRINCIPLES

SEC. 201. IMPLEMENTATION OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRINCIPLES.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that any person who—

(1) has a branch or office in South Africa, or

(2) controls a business enterprise in South Africa, should implement, in the operation of such branch, office, or business enterprise, those principles relating to employment practices set forth in section 20'.

(b) SANCTIONS.—

(1) APPLICABILITY.—The sanctions set forth in paragraph (2) shall apply to any person who—

(A) has a branch or office in South Africa, or

(B) controls a business enterprise in South Africa,

in which more than 20 people are employed, and who does not implement the principles set forth in section 202 in the operation of that business enterprise.

(2) **SANCTIONS.**—With respect to any person described in paragraph (1)—

(A) no department or agency of the United States may—

(i) enter into any contract with,

(ii) make any loan, issue any guaranty of a loan, or issue any insurance to,

(iii) provide any counseling on economic or political risks to, or

(iv) intercede with any foreign government or any national regarding the foreign investment or export marketing activities in any country of,

that person; and

(B) that person may not receive any credit or deduction under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for any income, war profits, or excess profits paid or accrued to South Africa.

SEC. 202. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES.

The principles referred to in section 201 are as follows:

(1) **DESEGREGATING THE RACES.**—Desegregating the races in each employment facility, including—

(A) removing all race designation signs;

(B) desegregating all eating, rest, and work facilities; and

(C) terminating all regulations which are based on racial discrimination.

(2) **EQUAL EMPLOYMENT.**—Providing equal employment for all employees without regard to race or ethnic origin, including—

(A) assuring that any health, accident, or death benefit plans that are established are nondiscriminatory and open to all employees without regard to race or ethnic origin; and

(B)(i) implementing equal and nondiscriminatory terms and conditions of employment for all employees, and (ii) abolishing job reservations, job fragmentation, apprenticeship restrictions for blacks and other nonwhites, and differential employment criteria, which discriminate on the basis of race or ethnic origin.

(3) **EQUITABLE PAY SYSTEM.**—Assuring that the pay system is equitably applied to all employees without regard to race or ethnic origin, including—

(A) assuring that any wage and salary structure that is implemented is applied equally to all employees without regard to race or ethnic origin;

(B) eliminating any distinctions between hourly and salaried job classifications on the basis of race or ethnic origin; and

(C) eliminating any inequities in seniority and in-grade benefits which are based upon race or ethnic origin.

(4) **MINIMUM WAGE AND SALARY STRUCTURE.**—Establishing a minimum wage and salary structure based on the appropriate local minimum economic level which takes into account the needs of employees and their families.

(5) **INCREASING BLACKS AND OTHER NONWHITES IN CERTAIN JOBS.**—Increasing, by appropriate means, the number of blacks and other nonwhites in managerial, supervisory, administrative, clerical, and technical jobs for the purpose of significantly increasing the representation of blacks and other nonwhites in such jobs, including—

(A) developing training programs that will prepare substantial numbers of blacks and

other nonwhites for such jobs as soon as possible, including—

(i) expanding existing programs and forming new programs to train, upgrade, and improve the skills of all categories of employees; and

(ii) creating on-the-job training programs and facilities to assist employees to advance to higher paying jobs requiring greater skills;

(B) establishing procedures to assess, identify, and actively recruit employees with potential for further advancement;

(C) identifying blacks and other nonwhites with high management potential and enrolling them in accelerated management programs;

(D) establishing and expanding programs to enable employees to further their education and skills at recognized education facilities; and

(E) establishing timetables to carry out this paragraph.

(6) **IMPROVING LIFE OUTSIDE THE WORKPLACE.**—Taking reasonable steps to improve the quality of employees' lives outside the work environment with respect to housing, transportation, schooling, recreation, and health, including—

(A) providing assistance to black and other nonwhite employees for housing, health care, transportation, and recreation either through providing facilities or services or providing financial assistance to employees for such purposes, including the expansion or creation of in-house medical facilities or other medical programs to improve medical care for black and other nonwhite employees and their dependents; and

(B) participating in the development of programs that address the education needs of employees, their dependents, and the local community.

(7) **FAIR LABOR PRACTICES.**—Recognizing labor unions and implementing fair labor practices, including—

(A) recognizing the right of all employees, regardless of racial or other distinctions, to self-organization and to form, join, or assist labor organizations, freely and without penalty or reprisal, and recognizing the right to refrain from any such activity;

(B) refraining from—

(i) interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of their rights of self-organization under this paragraph,

(ii) dominating or interfering with the formation or administration of any labor organization, or sponsoring, controlling, or contributing financial or other assistance to it,

(iii) encouraging or discouraging membership in any labor organization by discrimination in regard to hiring, tenure, promotion, or other condition of employment,

(iv) discharging or otherwise disciplining or discriminating against any employee who has exercised any rights of self-organization under this paragraph, and

(v) refusing to bargain collectively with any organization freely chosen by employees to represent them;

(C)(i) allowing employees to exercise rights of self-organization, including solicitation of fellow employees during nonworking hours, (ii) allowing distribution and posting of union literature by employees during nonworking hours in nonworking areas, and (iii) allowing reasonable access to labor organization representatives to communicate with employees on employer premises at reasonable times;

(D) allowing employee representatives to meet with employer representatives during working hours without loss of pay for pur-

poses of collective bargaining, negotiation of agreements, and representation of employee grievances;

(E) regularly informing employees that it is company policy to consult and bargain collectively with organizations which are freely elected by the employees to represent them; and

(F) utilizing impartial persons mutually agreed upon by employer and employee representatives to resolve disputes concerning election of representatives, negotiation of agreements or grievances arising thereunder, or any other matters arising under this paragraph.

(8) **INCREASED ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE WORKPLACE.**—Increasing the dimension of activities outside the workplace, including—

(A) supporting the unrestricted rights of businesses owned by blacks or other nonwhites to locate in the urban areas of South Africa;

(B) attempting to influence other companies in South Africa to implement equal rights principles;

(C) supporting the freedom of mobility of black and other nonwhite employees to seek employment opportunities wherever they exist, and making possible provisions for adequate housing for families of employees near the place of employment; and

(D) supporting the termination of all apartheid laws.

SEC. 203. GUIDELINES.

The Secretary may issue guidelines and criteria to assist persons who are or may be subject to this title in complying with the principles set forth in section 202. The Secretary may, upon request, give an advisory opinion to any person who is or may be subject to this title as to whether that person is subject to this title or would be considered to be in compliance with the principles set forth in section 202.

SEC. 204. ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.

(a) **AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall take the necessary steps to ensure compliance with the provisions of this title and any regulations, licenses, and orders issued to carry out this title. In ensuring such compliance, the Secretary shall establish mechanisms to monitor compliance with this title and such regulations, licenses, and orders, including onsite monitoring, at least once in every 2-year period, of each person subject to section 201(b) who files a report under subsection (b) of this section. In ensuring such compliance, the Secretary may conduct investigations, hold hearings, administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, take depositions, and require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of all books, papers, and documents relating to any matter under investigation.

(b) **REPORTS BY PERSONS SUBJECT TO SECTION 201.**—Each person subject to section 201(b) shall submit to the Secretary—

(1) a detailed and fully documented annual report on the compliance of that person with the principles set forth in section 202, and

(2) such other information as the Secretary considers necessary.

(c) **DETERMINATIONS OF COMPLIANCE.**—The Secretary shall, within 90 days after giving notice and an opportunity for a hearing to each person subject to section 201(b) who files a report under subsection (b) of this section, make a determination with respect to the compliance of that person with the employment principles set forth in section

202 and any regulations issued to carry out that section.

(d) **APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 201(b).**—The sanctions set forth in section 201(b)(2) shall apply to any person—

(1) who fails to file the reports required by subsection (b) of this section, or

(2) with respect to whom the Secretary makes a determination under subsection (c) or (f) of this section either that the person is not in compliance with the employment principles set forth in section 202 (or any regulation issued to carry out that section), or that such compliance cannot be established on account of a failure to provide information to the Secretary or on account of the provision of false information to the Secretary.

(e) **LIST OF PERSONS IN COMPLIANCE AND NONCOMPLIANCE.**—The Secretary shall issue a list of all persons with respect to whom determinations are made under subsection (c) and redeterminations are made under subsection (f), and what the determinations and redeterminations are. The Secretary shall distribute the list to all departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

(f) **REDETERMINATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to each person concerning whom a determination is made under subsection (c), the Secretary shall, at least once in every 2-year period, review and, in accordance with subsection (c), make a redetermination with respect to the compliance of that person with the employment principles set forth in section 202 and any regulations issued to carry out that section.

(2) **UPON REQUEST.**—In the case of any person with respect to whom the Secretary makes a determination under subsection (c) or paragraph (1) either that—

(A) the person is not in compliance with the employment principles set forth in section 202 (or any regulations issued to carry out that section), or

(B) such compliance cannot be established on account of a failure to provide information to the Secretary or on account of the provision of false information to the Secretary,

the Secretary shall, upon the request of that person and after giving that person an opportunity for a hearing, review and redetermine that person's compliance within 60 days after that person files the first annual report under subsection (b) after the negative determination is made.

(g) **JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DETERMINATIONS.**—Any person aggrieved by a determination or redetermination of the Secretary under subsection (c) or (f) may seek judicial review of that determination or redetermination in accordance with the provisions of chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress on the compliance of those persons subject to section 201(b) with the employment principles set forth in section 202.

SEC. 205. REGULATIONS.

The Secretary shall, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this title. The regulations shall include dates by which persons subject to section 201(b) must comply with the provisions of this title, except that the date for compliance with all the provisions of this title shall be not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 206. WAIVERS.

The President may waive the requirements of this title with respect to any

person if the waiver is necessary to protect the national security of the United States. The President shall publish each waiver in the Federal Register and shall submit each waiver and the justification for the waiver to the Congress.

SEC. 207. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) **PERSON.**—The term "person" means any individual, branch, partnership, associated group, association, estate, trust, corporation, or other organization, and any government (including a foreign government, the United States Government, a State or local government, and any agency, corporation, financial institution, or other entity or instrumentality of any such government, including a government-sponsored agency).

(2) **CONTROL.**—A person shall be presumed to control a business enterprise if—

(A) the person beneficially owns or controls (whether directly or indirectly) more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting securities of the business enterprise;

(B) the person beneficially owns or controls (whether directly or indirectly) 25 percent or more of the voting securities of the business enterprise, if no other person owns or controls (whether directly or indirectly) an equal or larger percentage;

(C) the business enterprise is operated by the person pursuant to the provisions of an exclusive management contract;

(D) a majority of the members of the board of directors of the business enterprise are also members of the comparable governing body of the person;

(E) the person has authority to appoint a majority of the members of the board of directors of the business enterprise; or

(F) the person has authority to appoint the chief operating officer of the business enterprise.

(3) **BUSINESS ENTERPRISE.**—The term "business enterprise" means any organization, association, branch, or venture which exists for profitmaking purposes or to otherwise secure economic advantage.

(4) **BRANCH.**—The term "branch" means the operations or activities conducted by a person in a different location in its own name rather than through a separate incorporated entity.

SEC. 208. APPLICABILITY TO EVASIONS OF TITLE.

This title and the regulations issued to carry out this title shall apply to any person who undertakes or causes to be undertaken any transaction or activity with the intent to evade this title or such regulations.

TITLE III—ADDITIONAL MEASURES REGARDING SOUTH AFRICA

SEC. 301. HUMAN RIGHTS FUND.

Section 118(e)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151n) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking out "1984 and" and inserting in lieu thereof "1984,";

(B) by inserting after "1985" the following: ", and \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1986 and for each fiscal year thereafter"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following: "Grants under this paragraph shall be made by the Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs."; and

(2) by striking out subparagraph (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

SEC. 302. NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY.

In addition to any other amounts made available to the National Endowment for

Democracy for the fiscal years 1986 and 1987, there is authorized to be appropriated for each of those fiscal years \$1,500,000 for private enterprise and free labor union development in the nonwhite communities in South Africa. Of the amounts authorized by the preceding sentence—

(1) \$500,000 for each such fiscal year shall be for the Free Trade Union Institute; and

(2) \$500,000 for each such fiscal year shall be for the Center for International Private Enterprise.

SEC. 303. SCHOLARSHIPS FOR BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS.

Section 105(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Beginning with the fiscal year 1986, and for each fiscal year thereafter, \$15,000,000 of assistance provided under this section shall be used to finance scholarships for black South Africans who are attending universities, colleges, and secondary schools in South Africa. Of the funds available under the preceding sentence to carry out this paragraph, not less than \$5,000,000 shall be available only for assistance to full-time teachers or other educational professionals pursuing studies towards the improvement of their professional credentials."

SEC. 304. OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.

(a) **ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN PROJECTS IN SOUTH AFRICA.**—Section 237(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2197(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "(a) Insurance" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), insurance"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Insurance, reinsurance, and guarantees of loans may be issued to cover an investment made in connection with a project in South Africa, notwithstanding the absence of an agreement with the Government of South Africa, except that—

"(A) the issuance of any such insurance, reinsurance, or guaranty shall only be made to promote joint ventures between business enterprises controlled or owned by South African blacks or other nonwhite South Africans and business enterprises controlled or owned by United States nationals; and

"(B) with respect to such a joint venture, the national or nationals of the United States hold a minority interest or agree to relinquish its majority interest during the course of the joint venture."

(b) **NATIONAL OF THE UNITED STATES DEFINED.**—Section 238 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2198) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c) by striking out "and" at the end thereof;

(2) in subsection (d) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) the term "national of the United States" means—

"(1) a natural person who is a citizen of the United States or who owes permanent allegiance to the United States; or

"(2) a corporation, partnership, or other enterprise if—

"(A) natural persons who are nationals of the United States own or control, directly or

indirectly, more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting securities;

"(B) natural persons who are nationals of the United States own or control, directly or indirectly, 25 percent or more of the voting securities, and natural persons of another nationality do not own or control an equal or larger percentage;

"(C) any natural person who is a national of the United States operates the corporation, partnership, or enterprise pursuant to the provisions of an exclusive management contract;

"(D) a majority of the members of the board of directors are also members of the comparable governing body of a corporation or legal entity organized under the laws of the United States, any State or territory thereof, or the District of Columbia; or

"(E) natural persons who are nationals of the United States have authority to appoint the chief operating officer."

SEC. 305. POLICY ON COOPERATION WITH ALLIED GOVERNMENTS.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should consult with the heads of governments of countries allied to the United States regarding the important issues raised by the existence of apartheid in South Africa, particularly the prospect for joint, effective action among the allied countries in the field of economic relations to bring about an end to apartheid.

SEC. 306. STUDY; REPORTS.

(a) **STUDY ON STARVATION AND MALNUTRITION IN HOMELANDS.**—The Secretary of State shall conduct a study to ascertain the amount of starvation and malnutrition taking place in the "homelands" areas of South Africa.

(b) **REPORT ON STUDY.**—The Secretary of State shall, not later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, prepare and transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report setting forth the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SOUTH AFRICA DEFINED.

For purposes of this Act, the term "South Africa" includes—

- (1) the Republic of South Africa,
- (2) any territory under the administration, legal or illegal, of South Africa, and
- (3) the "bantustans" or "homelands", to which South African blacks are assigned on the basis of ethnic origin, including the Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Ciskei, and Venda.

SEC. 402. CONSTRUCTION OF ACT.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as constituting any recognition by the United States of the homelands referred to in section 401(3).

SEC. 403. TERMINATION OF PROVISIONS OF ACT.

(a) **DETERMINATION OF ABOLITION OF APARTHEID.**—If the President determines that the system of apartheid in South Africa has been abolished, the President may submit that determination, and the basis for the determination, to the Congress.

(b) **JOINT RESOLUTION APPROVING DETERMINATION.**—Upon the enactment of a joint resolution approving a determination of the President submitted to the Congress under subsection (a), the provisions of this Act, and all regulations, licenses, and orders issued to carry out this Act, shall terminate.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of subsection (a), the "abolition of apartheid" shall include—

(1) the repeal of all laws and regulations that discriminate on the basis of race; and

(2) the establishment of a body of laws that assures the full national participation of all the people of South Africa in the social, political, and economic life in that country.

SEC. 404. COMPLIANCE WITH BUDGET ACT.

Any new spending authority (within the meaning of section 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) which is provided under this Act shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation acts. Any provision of this Act which authorizes the enactment of new budget authority shall be effective only for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985.

Amend the title so as to read: "A Bill to express the opposition of the United States to the apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa and to implement certain measures to encourage South Africa to change such policies."

By Mr. DELLUMS:

—At the end of title II (RDT&E) add the following new section:

SEC. . STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE FUNDING LIMITATIONS.

(a) **SDI ACTIVITIES TO BE CONSISTENT WITH 1972 ABM TREATY.**—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for research, development, test, and evaluation for fiscal year 1986 shall be available for activities of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization of the Department of Defense (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "SDIO") for any activity that is not fully consistent with the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems between the Soviet Union and United States (the "ABM Treaty").

(b) **LIMITATION ON DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 1986 for the SDIO may not be used for—

- (1) any technology demonstration project;
- (2) any "major experiment"; or
- (3) any activity that involves engineering development aimed at the construction of experimental hardware for operational testing.

(c) **LIMITATION OF FY 86 FUNDS FOR THE SDIO.**—Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986 for research, development, test, and evaluation, not more than \$954,900,000 shall be available for the SDIO. Such funds shall be available only as follows:

- (1) \$348,000,000 for surveillance, acquisition, track, and kill assessment,
- (2) \$249,000,000 for directed energy weapons,
- (3) \$149,900,000 for kinetic energy weapons,
- (4) \$99,000,000 for systems concepts and battle management,
- (5) \$109,000,000 for survivability, lethality, and key support technology,
- (6) \$8,000,000 for SDIO management headquarters.

(Amendment in the nature of a substitute.)

—Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

AThis Act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

- (1) to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986 at

levels consistent with a strong national defense and a sound national economy;

(2) to minimize the risk of nuclear confrontation;

(3) to eliminate areas of waste and abuse in the budget of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1985;

(4) to provide for improved military personnel policies designed to enhance readiness and morale; and

(5) to make other improvements in the management of the Department of Defense.

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons and tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, and for other procurement for the Army as follows:

- For aircraft, \$2,516,200,000.
- For missiles, \$1,141,200,000.
- For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, \$2,469,700,000.
- For ammunition, \$2,338,900,000.
- For other procurement, \$4,743,200,000.

SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for procurement of aircraft, weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), naval vessels, and for other procurement for the Navy and Marine Corps as follows:

- For aircraft, \$7,889,600,000.
- For weapons (including missiles and torpedoes), \$3,542,100,000.
- For naval vessels, \$4,817,300,000.
- For other procurement, \$5,266,300,000.
- For procurement for the Marine Corps (including missiles, tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons), \$1,674,700,000.

SEC. 103. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for procurement of aircraft and missiles and for other procurement for the Air Force as follows:

- For aircraft, \$13,570,800,000.
- For missiles, \$5,763,600,000.
- For other procurement, \$8,165,000,000.

SEC. 104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for procurement by defense agencies in the amount of \$500,000,000.

SEC. 105. LIMITATION ON ARMY PROCUREMENT.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations of appropriations in this title may be obligated or expended for the Pershing II missile program.

SEC. 106. LIMITATIONS ON NAVY PROCUREMENT.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations of appropriations in this title may be obligated or expended for the sea-launched cruise missile program.

SEC. 107. LIMITATIONS ON AIR FORCE PROCUREMENT.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations of appropriations in this title may be obligated or expended for—

- (1) the MX missile program;
- (2) the ground-launched cruise missile program;
- (3) the B-1B bomber program; or
- (4) antisatellite weapons.

SEC. 108. PROHIBITION OF ACQUISITION OF BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in sec-

tion 101 may be obligated or expended to purchase binary chemical weapons.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for the use of the Armed Forces for research, development, test, and evaluation in amounts as follows:

For the Army, \$4,546,700,000.

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), \$7,252,400,000.

For the Air Force, \$11,748,200,000.

For the Defense Agencies, \$4,135,300,000.

(b) In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 such additional sums as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a).

SEC. 202. LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR THE ARMY.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 201 may be obligated or expended for—

- (1) the Pershing II missile program; or
- (2) the ballistic missile defense program.

SEC. 203. LIMITATIONS ON FUNDS FOR THE NAVY.

None of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization in section 201 for the Navy may be used for—

- (1) the Trident II missile program; or
- (2) the sea-launched cruise missile program.

SEC. 204. LIMITATIONS ON FUNDS FOR THE AIR FORCE.

None of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization in section 201 for the Air Force may be used for—

- (1) the MX missile program;
- (2) the ground-launched cruise missile program;
- (3) the B-1B bomber program; or
- (4) antisatellite weapons.

SEC. 205. LIMITATIONS ON FUNDS FOR THE DEFENSE AGENCIES.

None of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization in section 201 for the Defense Agencies may be used for antisatellite weapons.

SEC. 206. PROHIBITION OF DEVELOPMENT OF BINARY CHEMICAL WEAPONS.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 201 may be obligated or expended for research, development, test, or evaluation of binary chemical weapons.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for the military functions of the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance in the amount of \$78,272,000,000.

(b) In addition to the funds authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 such additional sums as may be necessary—

(1) for increases in salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose compensation is provided for by funds authorized to be appropriated in such subsection;

(2) for unbudgeted increases in fuel costs; and

(3) for increases as the result of inflation in the cost of activities authorized by subsection (a).

SEC. 302. ELIMINATION OF NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE.

None of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization of appropriations in section 301 may be obligated or expended for the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice.

TITLE IV—WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

SEC. 401. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital funds, in the amount of \$1,860,000,000.

TITLE V—ACTIVE FORCES

SEC. 501. ACTIVE FORCES.

The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1986, as follows:

- (1) The Army, 751,300.
- (2) The Navy, 541,050.
- (3) The Marine Corps, 192,500.
- (4) The Air Force, 565,800.

TITLE VI—RESERVE FORCES

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF AVERAGE STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE.

(a) For fiscal year 1986 the Selected Reserve of the reserve components of the Armed Forces shall be programmed to attain average strengths of not less than the following:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 398,010.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 291,900.
- (3) The Naval Reserve, 94,000.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 41,900.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 108,700.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 63,736.
- (7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 10,700.

(b) The average strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by (1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at any time during the fiscal year, and (2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at any time during the fiscal year. Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the average strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be proportionately increased by the total authorized strength of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

SEC. 602. AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES.

(a) Within the average strengths prescribed in section 601, the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 1986, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 19,750.

(2) The Army Reserve, 10,700.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 11,680.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 1,475.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 6,815.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 545.

(b) Upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is in the national interest, the end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased by a total of not more than the number equal to 2 percent of the total end strengths prescribed.

SEC. 603. INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.

(a) The table in section 517(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
E-9.....	517	175	80	9
E-8.....	2,296	381	358	74

(b) The table in section 524(a) of such title is amended to appear as follows:

"Grade	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
Major or lieutenant commander.....	2,476	875	476	100
Lieutenant colonel or commander.....	1,240	520	318	60
Colonel or Navy captain.....	360	177	189	25

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

TITLE VII—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

SEC. 701. AUTHORIZATION OF END STRENGTH.

The provisions of section 138(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to fiscal year 1986 or with respect to the appropriation of funds for that year.

TITLE VIII—MILITARY TRAINING STUDENT LOADS

SEC. 801. AUTHORIZATION OF TRAINING STUDENT LOADS.

(a) For fiscal year 1986, the components of the Armed Forces are authorized average military training student loads as follows:

- (1) The Army, 57,990.
- (2) The Navy, 65,130.
- (3) The Marine Corps, 18,300.
- (4) The Air Force, 46,300.
- (5) The Army National Guard of the United States, 7,500.
- (6) The Army Reserve, 8,500.
- (7) The Naval Reserve, 1,050.
- (8) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,840.
- (9) The Air National Guard of the United States, 2,380.
- (10) The Air Force Reserve, 1,405.

(b) The average military student loads for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components authorized in subsection (a) for fiscal year 1986 shall be adjusted consistent with the manpower strengths authorized in titles V and VI of this Act. Such adjustment shall be apportioned among the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force and the reserve components in such manner as the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe.